DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 349 HE 029 015

TITLE	Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (107th, Chicago, Illinois, November 6-8, 1994).
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	95p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 710, Washington, DC 20036-1191.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role; *Colleges; Economic Development; Federal Aid; Financial Audits; Futures (of Society); Government Role; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Land Grant Universities; Outreach Programs; State Universities; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Bylaws; *National Assn of State Univ and Land Grant Coll; Sustainable Agriculture

ABSTRACT

This proceedings presents the discussion, business meetings, lectures, and speeches delivered at the 107th Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), including the organization's financial statement for December 31, 1993 and 1992. A report on the assembly, a list of elected heads of the association, a list of member institutions in 1994, and copy of the by-laws are included. Also included are remarks from the general session by Ellen Goodman, national columnist; the remarks given at the Council of Presidents Luncheon by Ernest L. Boyer on the higher education reform movement; and the text of the 1994 Seaman A. Knapp Memorial Lecture, "The Renaissance of Outreach in the Land-Grant Tradition" by Albert C. Yates, president of Colorado State University. The questions, answers, and exchanges of a joint programs session on "The Evolving Role of State Universities in the System of State Government Priorities: How and Where Should Our Institutions Position Themselves in Their States by the Year 2001?" are included. Finally, Thomas Malone's presentation, "Sustainable Human Development: A Paradigm for the 21st Century" is included. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 393 349

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NASULGC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Proceedings

of the

107th Annual Meeting

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

November 6-8, 1994

Chicago, Illinois

Published by

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 710
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 778-0818

Table of Contents

General Session:
Remarks by Ellen Goodman, Columnist
Boston Globe 1

Council of Presidents Luncheon:
Remarks by Ernest L. Boyer, President
The Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching 13

Seaman A. Knapp Memorial Lecture:
Remarks by Albert C. Yates, President
Colorado State University 22

Joint Program Session:
Council on Academic Affairs, Council on
Governmental Affairs, and Council on
University Relations and Development.
Remarks by Michael Crow, Columbia
University 36

Plenary Session:
Commission on Food, Environment, and
Renewable Resources: Remarks by
Thomas Malone, North Carolina State University 50

The Assembly 60

Treasurer's Report 61

Elected Heads of the Association 68

Member Institutions, 1994 72

Bylaws 78

General Session Address

Ellen Goodman
***Boston Globe* Columnist**

November 6, 1994

I tried to figure out why with these dubious credentials I was asked to talk to educators. I suppose I am here as an emissary from the real world and as an observer of change in that world.

What I would like to do for a few minutes this afternoon is to talk about the larger world in which you live and work--the fractious world beyond the campus that puts such enormous expectations on you and on your students.

Let me start by saying something about my own job. I was described a few minutes ago as a columnist. I remember years ago, overhearing my daughter telling a friend that. The friend reasonably asked what's a columnist. Katie thought a while and finally said, "My mother gets paid to tell people what she thinks."

To be a columnist, however, you need two qualifications: nerve and endurance--the egocentric confidence that your view of the world is important enough to write and to be read and the endurance to write day after day, year after year.

I have a colleague who dropped out of this endurance contest. He explained the business this way: Being a columnist is like being married to a nymphomaniac. Every time you think you are through, you have to start all over again.

This is an unenlightened but fairly accurate analogy.

But newspapers in general do two things. They tell people what has happened and they tell them what it means. I am in the what-it-means

end of the business. Over the last 25 years as our personal lives and our public life have become more complex, as we've been force fed more and more information, it has become much more important to wrest some meaning out of daily events. So as a bona fide member of the what-it-means journalism, I have the task of trying to make some sense out of the world we live in. In some modest, incomplete ways we are in the business of the business of education. We have that in common.

Making sense is not easy when news in front of us is O.J. Simpson or the politics of anger. It's not easy when most of the media dialogue in America has been reduced to opinion-hurling contests on television in which people compete for the most extreme position, in which we attempt to fight, rather than to enlighten.

It's especially not easy when you write about the subjects that have interested me during my career. If I had to put one word over my work, the word would be values. Indeed, I named my most recent book of columns, *Value Judgments*.

And that's what I wanted to talk about today. You as educators and I as a journalist are at the eye of a hurricane swirling around the word values.

Frankly, I thought of dedicating my remarks today to the two men who inspired the title of my speech, "Value Judgments"--Dan Quayle and Woody Allen. An odd couple if there ever was one.

It was the vice president and the filmmaker who were two bookends of the spectrum on just one of the great debates of our time and they made me think about that spectrum. They made me think about value judgments. Let me tell you why.

Probably one of the more bizarre footnotes in American history was recorded the day two years ago when Dan Quayle took on a fictional character named Murphy Brown. He said that, "Murphy Brown--a character who supposedly epitomizes today's intelligent, highly paid,

professional woman--mocked the importance of fathers by bearing a child alone and calling it just another lifestyle choice."

Now since then Mr. Quayle has rewritten his own history, and most Americans, cursed with a short-term-memory loss, haven't held him up to the original remarks.

But on that day in 1992, he began an enormous uproar about single mothers, abortion, absent fathers. About Family Values. It culminated with buttons at the Republican convention that read, "Dan's Right, Murphy's a Tramp." Now it says something--I dare not think what--when a fictional television creature becomes the text for one of the great social debates of our era about family.

The right wing had, to put it mildly, no reluctance making judgments about a fictional mother and tagging other real mothers at the same time. Many of us, myself included, had no trouble beating back the Quayle attack.

Then along came the news that the 57-year-old Woody Allen had proclaimed his love for the 21-year-old daughter of his former lover, Mia Farrow. Many of us, myself included, had no trouble shrieking. He was, to put it mildly, unencumbered by traditional values.

I still recall the testimony of the psychologist at Woody Allen's custody trial. These children seem to have been assigned a shrink at birth or adoption, the way other children are assigned a patron saint.

I will read just a short exchange between the lawyer and the psychologist. The lawyer asked the shrink: Was Woody evil? The shrink answered: I would say this was someone whose judgment is very impaired.

The lawyer asked the shrink: Was Mia wrong in her rage? [The shrink answered:] "I felt that for her to see Mr. Allen as an all-bad person was an overreaction."

It went on and on like this. It occurred to me that the only sane person at that trial was 14-year-old Moses Farrow Allen who had written Woody: "Everyone knows not to have an affair with your son's sister."

What struck me was that the Dan Quayle right wing makes judgments as easily as the knee jerks. But the Woody Allen wing has no judgment at all. And many of us who observe this odd debate from the middle and progressive end of the spectrum have become too paralyzed to make value judgments at all.

Now I do not side with people who want to put good and evil stickers on every piece of behavior. There are enough zealots in the world search for biblical proof that spandex is a creation of the devil. I am not comfortable with people who rush to judgment.

But over the past half-dozen years, it seems to me that we have been wrestling with issues that can only be described as issues of values. Indeed, my own computer search tells me that my newspaper had 642 articles in the past year that used the word values.

But the word has been loaded down with heavy political and moral implications. It was usurped by the right wing, the same people who took possession of another word: family.

Value judgments are still associated with commandments, ten or more. The phrase implies a clear cut, prepackaged set of one-size fits-all moral strictures. When we think of value judgments, we think of knee jerks rather than struggles.

My own dictionary defined value judgments this way: "an estimate made of the worth, goodness, of a person, action, event of the like, especially when making such a judgment is improper or undesirable." The dictionary makes a value judgment against value judgments.

So do many of us who are uncomfortable with the conservative or reactionary meaning of the phrase "traditional values." Indeed,

people who see the world in complex or personal terms often shy away from the words all together.

But judgment isn't the opposite of understanding or even compassion. To be valueless is not a compliment. The truth is that we all make decisions and choices. We use our own judgment, and base that judgment on our own values.

My favorite phrase about education comes from the architect Walter Gropius. He wrote: "The human mind is like an umbrella--it functions best when open." But at times I am afraid the close-minded have become the most open-mouthed.

While the open-minded, and I most certainly include educators, teachers among this group, are often uncertain, even inarticulate in using this language. I am convinced that to give up the language of values is to leave a powerful vocabulary to others, whether we agree with their definitions and their views or not. It's also to abandon the argument, and the struggle to mark out common ground in a country that often seems splintered. It's to abandon the intellectual marketplace.

So I talk about value judgments, in part, to take back the terms of the argument. To allow people to use this language and to wrestle with the demons and the hard questions that face us in public and private life that are indeed questions of our values.

If you want to think about how hard it is to talk about values in non-traditional terms, think about Hillary Clinton. We have all seen a dozen Hillarys since she first appeared as First Running Mate. The I'm-not-the-Tammy-Wynette Hillary, the cookie baking Hillary, the health care guru.

But she took the worst beating from the media when she was actually caught talking about the meaning of life and politics of meaning. She was trashed as a virtue-monger for suggesting that "we need a new politics of meaning. We need a new ethos of individual responsibility and caring...a society that fills us up and makes us feel we are part of

something bigger than ourselves." *The New York Times* dubbed her Saint Hillary. *The New Republic* went after her as sophomoric. And those were the liberals.

Now it is absolutely true that Hillary Clinton is a lightning rod for our time whatever she does. There hasn't been as controversial a woman in the White House since Eleanor Roosevelt.

Recently I asked Doris Goodwin, the Roosevelt historian, why Hillary is even more controversial than Eleanor. She said that Eleanor Roosevelt was so far ahead of her time as a woman that she was considered an eccentric. Today, Hillary Clinton is a Rorschach test of how people feel about changing roles of women. As Doris said, "Any man can worry that he [will] wake up in the morning and find out that his wife has become Hillary."

But both Hillary and Eleanor Roosevelt talk about values and the moral meaning behind public policy. And that is challenging.

The point is many of us are much more comfortable talking about policy than about meaning--as if the two weren't connected. And indeed, they have often been disconnected, or mis-wired in ways that ignite sparks, huge cultural fires.

In the last decade, progressives and moderates have been uneasy talking about values and yet we need the common language. We need to work our way through to a new common moral grounding in order to hold together our increasingly fragmented society.

Let me give you a few examples of the values questions we've been wrestling with over the last couple of decades.

Perhaps the most intriguing issues for the values debate is about the relationship between public and private life. In this election, for example, in many places character has become THE political issue.

When I was growing up, Americans knew a President almost solely by his public behavior. Indeed, earlier than that, during the time when

Roosevelt was President, the public rarely saw FDR in a wheelchair. There was an understanding among the small press corps not to take photographs of him struggling in or out of the wheelchair, and if a photographer tried to take a picture of FDR that way, the other photographers essentially formed a shield around the President. Imagine that today. My colleagues hustle to get the worst possible angle on a president.

The way we handled these matters wasn't all good. When JFK was President, there was essentially a gentleman's agreement among the small, all-male press corps that they wouldn't tell "the little woman"--in this case the public--about his private sexual behavior.

That agreement cracked as women cracked into the business. In essence, women believed in the words of the old women's movement slogan that the personal was political. That how you treated other people had meaning for who you were and how you would behave in public life. We aren't as comfortable separating out public and private values.

But gradually, the pendulum has swung. We haven't always been able to balance the private and public side. After Gary Hart committed character suicide, it became harder and harder to figure out how to balance public and private behavior. When is the discussion of private behavior a matter of character investigation and when is it just tabloid gossip?

Today, we seem less concerned with public morality and more with private ethics. We had Jennifer Flowers and Paula Jones. We have news stories coming from *The Globe*--not *The Boston Globe*, I assure you--and news entertainment. An illegal nanny was enough to end Zoe Baird's nomination to the Attorney General's job. Bob Packwood, a friend of feminist legislation, has ended up as a case study in sexual harassment.

This election year the character issue is more layered and more complex than ever. In Massachusetts, Ted Kennedy is running against Ted Kennedy for re-election. There are many people

questioning the character of Ted Kennedy, the private man, the one who comes with labels like Chappaquiddick and Palm Beach. There are other people who associate his character with his moral commitment to human rights, education. Some people do both.

In Virginia, the character issue is between Charles Robb, who had an extramarital massage, and Oliver North, who had an extracurricular foreign policy.

Which is worse--to lie to your wife or to Congress? Each side regards the other as a flawed character, attacking American values. Each is running ads calling the other a liar.

There is much talk that is gossip. Much throwing about of the word values. But little serious discussion about how to assess the complex and often conflicting parts of a human life. Private values against public values?

I think it is true that the prominence of the values issues has happened in concert with the women's movement. But it's also within what we call the women's movement.

Certainly one of the ripest issues of values is connected to the current stage of the women's movement. I tend to think of the women's movement literally as the movement of women from one life pattern to many.

This is the single largest social change of my lifetime, and I have spent much of my life and my career observing the uneven, lopsided pace of social change we call the women's movement.

Here, too, I think the conversation, the public dialogue, has to move from the languages of rights and the language of values. And here, too, women who are part of the movement have had trouble articulating their choices and their concerns in that language. Or should I say in that voice, our own voice. It's the conversation about meaning that has left the most open-minded the most tongue-tied.

We all know that this has been an era in which change was lopsided. Since the onset of the women's movement, more women have taken on the old male roles than men have taken on the old female roles. This is not a news bulletin.

We have moved from the myth of Supermom to the myth of Superwoman to the image of Superdrudge, the woman who wanted to have it all and so got stuck with it all.

It's been lopsided in part because women have had more success at getting into the male world than changing that world.

What we haven't recognized is that women have much more success not only in adapting to male roles and male life patterns but in adapting to what were traditional male values than in getting men to adapt to traditionally female values.

It has been much easier to win equal access to the values of achievement, power, success, and competition than to win equal time for the values of caretaking, nurturing, and cooperation. As a result, the country has suffered a net loss in the amount of caretaking.

What was for a decade seen as a conflict in roles has moved to a deeper crisis in values that we don't talk about easily. Values of caretaking and the values of achievement.

I don't think women can ever achieve equality in our own terms until we achieve equality for the values of caretaking, family life, community, and connections that we were assigned and have held high.

But those of us who are and have been part of the women's movement have had trouble talking about this in new terms without being afraid that any time we admit our concern about children and parents we'll be sent back to the kitchen.

We have to acknowledge that this spills over onto another crisis that is another issue of values that seems hard for us to resolve about in coherent ways. This is my last example of values debates.

One of the oldest tensions in American life is one that you know about: the tension between the values of individualism and those of community; between the I and the we; between the sense that each one of us is responsible for our own life, has to make it on our own, and the belief that life only has meaning when lived with others.

For much of American history, we solved the tension by divvying up the areas. By large, women maintained the values of community. We kept up the connections and maintained caretaking, while men upheld the ideal of individualism.

Now that women are joining men in seeing themselves as individuals too, we must both recognize the lopsidedness of change, the need for restoring the values of community together.

This may be a particularly important issue for the public universities. You were established on common ground with the mission of nurturing individuals. The tension between those values can be heard in the debates about political correctness, speech codes. The conflict between creating a coherent community and allowing room for individual differences. Conflicts that generate more heat than light.

In short, this is a period of enormous change. Yet in this period much of what passes for debate is argument. This is the era characterized by the Triumph of the Yell. And in my business, the triumph of the yeller.

On news shows like *The McLaughlin Group* and *Crossfire*, debate has become an intellectual food fight. On *Rush Limbaugh* and similar talk shows, there is interest in wielding the ax, not the insight. In Congress as well, it's become the trench warfare in which the weapon is dueling soundbites at 20 paces.

The people we hear don't leave much space for ambivalence, for ambiguity, for subtlety. In my life, I have discovered that the quickest way to avoid going on *Nightline*--I am not a night person--is to tell the booker looking for a guest a strong, "Well, I have mixed feelings about that."

In this campaign, the triumph of the yell means the triumph of the negative ad. Very few candidates speak in a language that resonates with us. And the irony is that when they use the values word--the V word--it's as a weapon of assault rather than an instrument for assaying common ground.

On campuses, too, we have polarized groups taking sides, while many of the rest of us--those with mixed feelings--remain silent. It's precisely those mixed feelings that need an airing and some incremental resolution.

We hold two very different sets of moral attitudes in America. One is essentially about obeying commandments. The other is about relationships. The first is as straightforward as sin. The second is as complicated as human feelings. It's the second one that interests me. In such an atmosphere, educators can't leave the discussion ground.

We're in an era when Americans agree on the questions. How will our values play out as we approach the turn of the century, particularly the values of individualism and community? How will we take care of each other in a changing economy? What is the future for our children?

We have to engage in the business of creating policies through values, through conversation, through thoughtful exploration, rather than through the yell.

To say that the campuses are at the heart of this is to state the obvious. Many of our deepest conflicts over values take place in schools, over schools. The universities and colleges have become one of the few places where we try and work out community values and

yet also fight about them. The schools are at once one of the very few examples of common ground and yet also combat zones.

You are our last hope for muting the politics of the yell and raising another generation whose minds work like umbrellas.

It's a tall order, perhaps the most important task of our time, if we are to resolve some of the most wrenching questions of our time, if we are to make value judgments the way porcupines make love--very, very carefully.

Indeed, sometimes I think that Jack Kerouac, the beat generation poet, may well have written the best motto for educators in 1994 way back in the 1950s when he warned us: Walking on water wasn't born in a day.

16

Council of Presidents Luncheon Address

Higher Learning and National Renewal

Ernest L. Boyer, President
The Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching

November 7, 1994

I'm delighted to join you at this 107th meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, which is one of the most vital and most influential higher learning associations in the nation.

And I'm especially pleased to be with Peter Magrath again, a dear friend and colleague who has contributed so profoundly to higher learning, not *only* in New York, where we worked together, but throughout the nation, and now as president of America's oldest higher education association.

Coming back to this annual conference of the National Association of State Universities is for me like coming home. The "land-grant" meetings were one of the highlights of my days as chancellor in New York. While preparing these remarks I recalled that my very first session with this group occurred in Chicago during the summer of 1970, when all of the presidents were called together in emergency session to discuss campus riots. They keynote speaker on that occasion was a chief of police who seemed energized by all the campus chaos, and whose idea of strategic planning was a deep commitment to drug busts, tear gas, and mass arrests.

I. REFORM

This afternoon I've been asked to talk about the reform movement in American higher education. Naysayers notwithstanding, I'm convinced that American colleges and universities are enormously

healthy and responsive institutions. I'm also convinced that renewal is, in fact, occurring on campuses from coast to coast, with emphasis on teaching, on new technology, on the quality of campus life, and on better ways to measure the results. All of these priorities are absolutely crucial.

I believe that undergraduate education is experiencing a renaissance, but I also believe that the most compelling challenge for reform, at least for state universities and land-grant colleges, is finding ways to relate the resources of the campus to our most pressing social problems. Above all, it's to build a partnership with schools and improve the quality of life for children.

II. LOOKING BACK

The simple truth is that higher eduction and the larger purposes of American society have always been inextricably interlocked. In the colonial college, the goal was piety, as well as civic virtue. And as John Eliot wrote in 1636, "If we nourish not *larning* both church *and* commonwealth will sinke."

During the dark days of the Civil War, President Lincoln signed the historic Land Grant Act that linked higher learning to the nation's agricultural and industrial revolution. And when social critic Lincoln Steffens visited Madison in 1909 he observed that, "In Wisconsin, the university is as close to the intelligent farmer as his pig-pen or his tool-house."

David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford, declared in 1903 that the entire university movement in this country is toward "reality" and "practicality." Harvard's president Charles Eliot said that America's universities are filled with the democratic spirit of "serviceability." Woodrow Wilson, as president of Princeton University, declared that it's not learning but the spirit of service that will give a college a place in the public annals of the nation.

I consider it enormously consequential that just one hundred years ago the words "practicality," "utility," and "serviceability" were used by

the nation's most respected academic leaders to describe the essential mission of higher learning.

III. THE 20TH CENTURY

During my own lifetime, Vannevar Bush of MIT declared that the universities that helped win the war could also win the peace--which led to the greatest federally funded research effort the world had ever seen. In the 1940s, the G.I. Bill brought eight million veterans back to the campus, which sparked in this country a revolution of rising expectations.

In 1947, Secretary of State George Marshall announced a plan for European recovery, and in response the nation's scholars promoted good will and economic progress all around the world. When Sputnik rocketed into orbit, the nation's colleges were called upon once again, this time to reform the school curriculum and to offer summer institutes for teachers.

I realize that I've just covered three and one-half centuries in three and one-half minutes. But the larger point I've tried to make is that the story of America and the story of higher learning are inseparably intertwined, and that the nation's campuses have from the very first been "in service to the nation," as Woodrow Wilson put it.

IV. TODAY'S DETACHMENT

But what's the relationship today? Where does higher learning fit in national renewal? It's obvious that both teaching and basic research are a service to the nation. But what's also obvious is that higher education's historic commitment to public service has in recent years dramatically diminished.

It's true that the mission statement of almost every university in the country includes teaching, research, and service. But it's also true that at tenure and promotion time service is less well regarded. Beyond the campus, the nation's colleges and universities

increasingly are viewed as not the solution, but the problem. And what's especially troublesome is the growing feeling in this country that higher education is a private benefit, not a public good.

What are we to do about all of this?

In a recent Carnegie report entitled, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, we propose a new paradigm of scholarship--one that promotes not only the scholarship of *discovering* knowledge through research, but also celebrates the scholarship of *integrating* knowledge, the scholarship of *sharing* knowledge, and also the scholarship of *applying* knowledge, through outreach beyond the campus. All of these acts of scholarship should be properly rewarded.

Of course, we need great centers of research, and of course teaching must be honored, but service surely must be recognized as well, which means something far more than "doing good," or serving on campus committees, although such activities are obviously important.

When we speak of the scholarship of application, we mean relating the theory of research to the realities of life, with professors being "reflective practitioners," to use Donald Schon's helpful formulation. But for such service to be considered real scholarship, we need clearly defined standards for evaluation, which, incidentally, we're attempting to develop in a follow-up Carnegie report called *Scholarship Assessed*.

I'm suggesting that higher education reform means focusing with special urgency on the challenges of *our* time, just as the land-grant colleges focused on agriculture and industry a century ago. And the need for such engagement was never more compelling.

V. CRISIS AMONG CHILDREN

Consider, for example, the crisis among children. Today, nearly one out of every four children under the age of six is classified as "poor." Forty thousand babies born each year are damaged by alcohol abuse. The mothers of 10 percent of all newborns used drugs during

pregnancy, which can restrict the child's capacity to learn. And one-fifth of all pregnant women in this country receive belated prenatal care--or none at all. And then we talk about all children coming to school "ready to learn."

These statistics may seem irrelevant to higher education. But education is a seamless web and there is simply no way to sustain excellence in the upper grades if there's failure in the early years, which are traditionally the most important.

Last year, at Texas Woman's University, I visited a residence hall for single mothers and their children. While the mothers worked and attended class, the children were cared for in a day care center run by college students, in a "service learning" program. And the university's nursing school had established a medical clinic for mothers and babies at a nearby housing project. Programs such as this can be found on many campuses from coast to coast, but all too often they are underfunded and undervalued.

In a Carnegie Foundation report called *Ready to Learn*, we conclude that school readiness is in fact everybody's business--parents, churches, businesses, day care centers, as well as schools. And colleges have an essential role to play. One suggestion: Perhaps the nation's public universities could establish a network of Ready to Learn Councils all across the state, just like the land-grant colleges created "agricultural-export" status a century ago.

The goal of these councils would be to coordinate the work of all the children's agencies in every community and prepare an annual children's report card on children's health care, and library services, and parks and playgrounds, and the day care services for preschools in communities all across the state--a kind of children's impact statement.

James Agee wrote on one occasion that every child who is born, under no matter what circumstances, the potentiality of the human race is born again. And with *medical* schools and *education* schools and *law* schools and *public policy* schools, surely universities can help

improve the lives of children, not only through research, but through outreach, too, helping to create in the community a public love of children.

VI. THE SCHOOLS

But if all children are to be well prepared for school, all schools must be ready for the children. In the century ahead universities also have a special obligation to reach out to schools. We hear endless talk these days about how the schools have failed, and it's true that education must improve, but the longer it goes on the more I'm convinced it's not the school that's failed, it's the partnership that's failed.

Today's teachers are expected to do what the homes and the churches and the communities have not been able to accomplish, and if they fail anywhere along the line, we condemn them for not meeting our high-minded expectations. Yet I'm convinced that most school critics could not survive one week in the classrooms they condemn.

When I was U.S. Commissioner of Education, I visited an inner city school with a leaking roof, with broken test tubes, and Bunsen burners that wouldn't work, with textbooks ten years old, with falling plaster, with armed guards in corridors. And then we wonder why we're not world-class in math and science, or in *anything*, for that matter.

And especially troublesome is our lack of support for teachers. In the United States today teachers spend, on average, four hundred dollars of their own money every year to buy essential school supplies. And teachers in this country are expected to teach 31 hours every week with virtually no time for preparation, while in Germany it's 27 hours, and in Japan it's only 21. Perhaps it's here that we should try to beat the Japanese.

In this country the average kindergarten class size is 27, even though research reveals that in the lower grades the optimum class size is 17. In one state the average kindergarten class size is 41. Then we have

the audacity to talk about excellence in education. I really do believe that if this nation would give as much status to first grade teachers as we give to full professors, that one act alone could revitalize the nation's schools. I'm not suggesting that we take our educators off the hook. I am suggesting that if we want better schools, we don't need more rules and regulations, we need more teacher recognition.

Several years ago, the State University of New York at Fredonia asked all incoming freshmen to name the most outstanding teacher they had had from kindergarten to twelfth grade. The college president then sent a letter to each of the outstanding teachers thanking them for their contribution to education. It's such a simple thing. And yet if every college and university in the country sent such "thank you's" literally millions of teachers would, each year, be professionally reaffirmed. But beyond the "thank you's," universities also should consider moving their teacher training programs off the campus and into schools, with master teachers as the mentors.

Universities also might consider giving scholarship to gifted students who plan to enter teaching, as we give scholarships to gifted athletes. And universities surely can have summer fellowships for teachers. About a dozen years ago, the late Bart Giammati invited me to evaluate the Yale-New Haven Teacher Institute. I was delighted to discover that some of Yale's most distinguished scholars directed the summer seminars, which teachers themselves had planned. Incidentally, the teachers in that program were called "Yale Fellows," and they were even given a parking sticker, which is about the highest status symbol a university can bestow. It's even better than an honorary doctorate.

Again, I'm suggesting that universities can bring excellence to the nation's schools by helping to renew the teachers in our schools, who are, I am convinced, the unsung heroes of the nation.

VII. URBAN AMERICA

This leads me to say one final word about the cities, with violence, unemployment, poverty, and despair, especially among the youth.

During our study of the American high school, I became convinced that we have not just a school problem, but a youth problem in this nation. Many teenagers feel unwanted, unneeded, unconnected to the larger world. There is even a spirit of anonymity in the school itself. I concluded that many students drop out because no one noticed that they had, in fact, dropped in.

And if I had just one wish, I'd break up every large urban school into units of no more than 400 students each. These mini-schools could become service centers for the communities that surround them, with health and recreation and counseling for families and older people, too.

And perhaps it's here that the professional schools and universities would have a special role to play. Again, the problems of urban life are enormously complex, and yet I find it ironic that universities that focused with great energy on rural America have never focused with equal urgency on cities.

Ira Harkavy, of the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Continuing Partnerships, warns that: "Universities cannot afford to remain shores of affluence, self-importance, and horticultural beauty at the edge of squalor, violence, and despair."

It is true that many universities do sponsor urban renewal projects--in such cities as Detroit, Buffalo, New York City, Philadelphia, Baltimore, just to name a few. But it's also true that these so-called "model programs" often operate on the edges of the campus with little financial support. And it's true, as well, that faculty who invest too much time in such projects often jeopardize their careers.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The nation's colleges and universities have more human resources and more potential for renewal than any other institution in our culture. While universities cannot solve every social and economic and civic problem, they do have, I believe, both the opportunity as well as an urgent obligation to give priority not only to research and

teaching, but to service, too, with the campus being viewed not as an isolated island, but a staging ground for action.

More than a half century ago, Oscar Handlin put the challenge this way: "Our troubled planet can no longer afford the luxury of pursuits confined to an ivory tower. Scholarship has to prove its worth not on its own terms, but by service to the nation and the world."

Forty years ago, I took my first teaching job at a little liberal arts college in California. That began, for me, a love affair with higher learning that's continued to this day. Looking back, I feel more privileged than I can ever say that I've been able to participate in the most exhilarating half century of higher education in human history, a moment that may never come again.

And looking forward to the year 2000 I am absolutely confident that America's colleges and universities will remain at the vital center of the nation's work, and that we will, in fact, build a better world for *all* children, not just the most advantaged.

- - - -

1994 Seaman A. Knapp Memorial Lecture

The Renaissance of Outreach in the Land-Grant Tradition

Presented by

Albert C. Yates
President
Colorado State University

Good morning! Like others before me, I am here today to talk about change. And in doing so, I realize that the need for change is not always easy to recognize--just ask the former sales manager at General Motors who said, "Don't worry, boss, nobody's going to buy those little Japanese cars!" Or the record company president who couldn't figure out why anyone would want to put music on Scotch tape. Change is a demanding subject--difficult to envision, frightening to orchestrate, and essential to the progress of any organization.

It is truly an honor to join you here today and to be asked to deliver the Seaman A. Knapp Memorial Lecture--named in honor of the man whose spirit and will did so much to shape the outreach mission of the land-grant university.

I've entitled my remarks "The Renaissance of Outreach in the Land-Grant Tradition," as an indication of a renewed vitality in the mission and activities of many colleges and universities. Historically, of course, "renaissance" refers to "the cultural rebirth that occurred in Europe from roughly the fourteenth through the middle of the seventeenth centuries"--a period marked by the contributions of men like Galileo, Shakespeare, da Vinci, Michelangelo. But, less specifically, the term "renaissance" means a revival--a rediscovery--a rebirth.

Today, I intend to talk about the need for a revitalization--a renaissance, if you will--in our outreach agendas. But, before there can be a renaissance, there must first be a birth. And for university outreach, that occurred largely as a result of Seaman Knapp's work.

Consider, for example, back in the early 1900's, when the boll weevil was threatening to destroy the cotton industry. The U.S. Department of Agriculture developed a plan to control the damage wrought by the pest by teaching farmers how to grow their cotton so it would mature earlier. Seaman Knapp was then 70 years old and already had led a successful career as a farmer, a professor of agriculture, and as President of Iowa Agricultural College. He was the logical choice to take this new program directly to the cotton planters, many of whom were resistant to changing their ways.

As Wayne Rasmussen wrote in his history of Cooperative Extension:

> "Experience and observation had convinced Knapp that reading pamphlets or observing work on demonstration farms operated at government expense would not lead farmers to change their practices. Rather, they could be convinced of the value of change through demonstrations carried on by the farmers themselves on their own farms and under ordinary farm conditions...as Knapp put it: 'What a man hears, he may doubt; what he sees, he may possibly doubt; but what he does, he cannot doubt.'"

The boll weevil project was a success, and led, in part, to the creation of Cooperative Extension as we know it today--as Knapp defined it, "a system of rural education...by which a readjustment of country life can be effected and placed upon a higher plane of profit, comfort, culture, influence and power."

The issues Knapp was addressing, even at that time, were issues of dramatic change in the fabric of American life and work. In 1900, 60 percent of the U.S. population still lived on farms or in communities with less than 2,500 citizens--but that percentage already had declined dramatically over the decades since the Civil War. He looked around

him and saw a changing world--a cherished way of life threatened by the searing demands of economic progress and social evolution. Through his labor and vision, many people were able to salvage their livelihood and their dreams by learning to discard old, unworkable methods in favor of more progressive ways.

The importance of Knapp's achievements still is evident in events such as this one, the lecture series named in his honor, focusing upon those subjects that compelled his life's work.

Still, one can't help but wonder--when considering the innovation, the inventiveness, the aggressive entrepreneurship that characterized Knapp's work--whether his vision still lives and breathes in Cooperative Extension as it now exists. I wonder, for example, how the sentence I read a moment ago might be rewritten if Seaman Knapp were alive today. Would Knapp today say, for example, Cooperative Extension is "a system of education"--not *rural* education--"by which a readjustment of life"--not *country* life--"can be effected and placed upon a higher plane of profit, comfort, culture, influence, and power." Have we missed the essence of his philosophy, the point of his admonitions? Have we been too literal in interpreting his concept of Extension? Too often it seems we do things as we've always done them, seeking to solve problems that no longer exist or matter but little.

Not long ago, I sat on a panel at the University of Wyoming, challenged to address this question: What role should land-grant universities and Extension play in responding to the contemporary needs of society? These are two questions, really: The role of the land-grant university? And the role of Cooperative Extension within it? A first observation, then, is that Cooperative Extension, with its narrow and specialized agenda, cannot exist independent of the university. Too many Americans with little understanding of the role and structure of agriculture see Cooperative Extension as irrelevant and unresponsive--too often pursuing programs of little interest to mainstream society.

Over the past few years, I've spoken frequently about the special, almost exalted position occupied by land-grant universities in this country's scheme of higher education institutions. Aristotle believed institutions reflect the character of a people, and people reflect the character of their institutions. No American institution better reflects the values and character of our society than does the land-grant university, and none is better positioned to make such an extraordinary difference in this country's future. Conceived as a practical and political construct, the uniqueness of the land-grant university is derived from the special interplay of teaching, research, and public service in extending knowledge to a broad public constituency.

This uniqueness, until recently, could boast an infrastructure that was responsive and adaptive, grounded in a mutually supportive relationship that spreads across all sections of society. Now, too many people believe our colleges and universities--including land-grant institutions--have grown out of touch and are unwilling or unable to adjust to the pace and substance of world change. Their fears, in many ways, are motivated by the dramatic transformations taking place in their own lives and work.

Vice President Al Gore said recently:

> "The last time public cynicism sank to its present depth may have been exactly 100 years ago...that was a time when Americans felt the Earth moving under their feet. Debt and depression forced farmers off the land and into cities they found cold and strange and into factories where human beings became scarcely more than extensions of machines. Cynicism was soon abroad in the land.
>
> "We are now in the midst of another historic and unsettling economic transformation. Now the information revolution is leading to a loss of jobs in many factories, as computers and automation replace human labor...just as most of those who lost their jobs on the farm 100 years ago eventually found new work in factories, so today new jobs are opening up in

new occupations created by the information revolution--but this time the transition is taking place more swiftly and the economic adjustment is, for many, more difficult and disorienting."

Once again we need the visionary leadership of a Seaman Knapp and others to assist in charting our course and blunting the seemingly rampant cynicism. In fact, there appears to be an essential disconnect between what the public wants from its institutions of higher education and what our institutions are providing. Yet, this connection has been the historical hallmark of Extension and the land-grant philosophy.

Too many people in our Nation now believe strongly that a college education has become indispensable and less and less within reach; costs to the consumer are rising too fast, often double the rate of inflation or more; to much emphasis is placed on research and not enough on students and teaching; colleges and universities seem intent on serving their own ambitions, often ignoring important social needs; and too many of our graduates lack the basic knowledge to compete successfully in the global marketplace or to accept the obligations and responsibilities of life in a democratic society. And much of this is true! So how do we respond?

Before we can set the course of change in our universities, we must agree on the challenges to be met by our institutions. A recent report on university outreach at Michigan State University frames the challenge in this way:

"(As a Nation), we are struggling with the advent of a global economy in which all economic sectors must be prepared to compete. We are experiencing the growth of an underclass characterized by high unemployment, crime and a breakdown of the social fabric. We confront a crisis among our youth who struggle with substance abuse, teen pregnancy, academic failure, crime and delinquency, and the search for meaning in their lives. Environmental challenges threaten our capacity to pass on to future generations enough fresh air

to breathe, clean water to drink, and safe food to eat. We live with a health care system that grows increasingly costly and inaccessible for large numbers of our population. As a Nation, we are undergoing a fundamental cultural transformation as thousands of immigrants (and I would add, nonimmigrants) bring a new vitality, diversity, and pluralism to our communities..."

The response to these challenges will differ for different institutions. Surely, our choices will be influenced by our history and traditions, by the needs and economics of our state, and by our strengths and ability to make a difference. Yet, I think there are some common steps to be taken by all of our institutions. I'd like to suggest six:

1. Now is the time for uncommon candor and honesty. We must admit that not all we do is good or useful; that we have gone too far in responding to every conceivable demand placed on our resources; and that rebuilding "vital connections" to a disenchanted public is the only sure route to survival. Changing our behavior will require a continuous process of asking ourselves--in earnest--who are we and where are we going?

2. Greater priority must be given to students and instruction, to the transmission and understanding of knowledge on campus *and* in our outreach programs. We must address concerns about the structure and content of our curricula and rededicate ourselves to the development of human potential. The infrastructure and mindset of the land-grant institutions are well poised for this task as we seek to extend our services and resources to an increasingly diverse and widespread clientele.

3. As research universities, the land-grant institutions must become more focused and directed in their research and graduate programs. Being a contemporary comprehensive university does not mean we must offer and pursue every discipline, subdiscipline, and research specialty. At Colorado State University, for example, this has meant investing principally in those areas that demonstrate the reality or promise of national

and international status and/or those areas that can make truly significant contributions to problems of social and economic import. Such a strategy must also maintain the *opportunity* for excellence in all areas of scholarship. This altered view of the university's research enterprise includes strengthening the bond between research and outreach by giving priority to technology transfer efforts and creating partnerships with business, industry, and government.

4. Enhancing the ethnic and cultural diversity of our campuses is an imperative that surely cannot be ignored. This, we must do in recognition of the changing complexion of our country and the need to have greater numbers of our population contributing to the Nation's economy. How can any nation expect to remain strong and compete on a global scale by ignoring or discounting the talents of 25 percent to 40 percent of its population? On campus, this will mean greater attention to an environment and support structure promoting the success of *all* students; off campus, it will mean engaging populations and issues that have received little attention by our institutions.

5. Infusing an international perspective into our teaching, research, and outreach programs will continue to be important to the success of our students and external clientele. Conceptualizing life and living on a global scale is needed to inform decisions about matters that transcend national boundaries: interdependent national economies, global ecological balances, armed conflict, famine and disease, population growth, and so on. Consideration of such issues will require that we redefine our outreach arena as global in its scale and all-inclusive in its audience.

6. Perhaps our greatest opportunities to enhance our importance and regain the public trust rest in the pursuit of our outreach agenda--that is, how we extend ourselves beyond the campus in service to our many external clientele. Real success, however, in this defining piece of the land-grant mission requires that we raise the level of importance of outreach as a university function-

-embracing it (to paraphrase the Michigan State report) as a scholarly activity equivalent in status and distinction to teaching and research and cutting across all areas of knowledge. Viewing outreach in this way is an acknowledgement of our responsibility to address the social and technical issues that often enrage and perplex our society. It is here, too, that we signal our intentions to apply our expertise to the concerns of urban and rural development, to lifelong learning and continuing education, to the problems of K-12 education, to personal health and safety, drug abuse, youth at risk, and more.

Implied in these suggestions is that outreach is much more than Cooperative Extension and encompasses the entire campus; it is more than agriculture and the development of rural communities. On many of our campuses the most successful and best-supported outreach activities do not involve Cooperative Extension. At Colorado State, for example:

- The newly-formed Center for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education already has become a model for linking higher education and K-12 education to mutual benefit. In this year alone, the Center, in collaboration with public school districts and other colleges and universities, has received competitive grants and private contributions well in excess of $8 million.

- Our Manufacturing Excellence Center, created to provide technical assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturing companies in research and technology transfer, recently joined the U.S. Department of Commerce to assist defense contractors affected by the downsizing of the U.S. Department of Defense.

- Concerns of youth are being addressed by our Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research that conducts and distributes research results on prevention of problems of ethnic minority youth including drug use, delinquency, and drop-out rates.

- One of Colorado State's most successful outreach efforts is under the aegis of the Center for Educational Access and Outreach charged "to make education accessible to all persons and groups." The center, funded almost entirely from grant funds, implements it purpose by developing the talent of ethnically diverse, first-generation, or limited-income individuals during their precollege years.

These are but a few of the dozens of programs and activities that extend the university's knowledge base in myriad ways. What then, is the common ingredient of all these efforts? All are funded principally from external sources and all are addressing social and economic issues important to large segments of the population.

Regrettably, these and other such examples suggest strongly that Cooperative Extension has become quite marginal to the university's outreach agenda and direction. Many now believe that Cooperative Extension must change radically if it is to survive even the present decade. Yet despite the growing criticism, I believe the concept of Cooperative Extension remains valid and essential because of its capacity to deliver consumer-responsive, informal education; its potential to be a significant conduit for the transfer of research, technology, and information to disparate groups and locations; and its longstanding and proven effectiveness in youth and family development programs.

Still, the voice of change grows more strident, more demanding. We have reached the point where even those of us who are cheerleaders for the system must collectively recognize the many forces that have acted to bring Cooperative Extension to its current state of diminishing public support:

- a self-protecting bureaucracy that too often "circle the wagons" as a first response to criticism;

- a strong resistance to change the programs that attract only small and narrowly defined audiences;

- the continuation of programs created in a different time to address problems long solved or forgotten; and

- the continuing attempt to certify performance on the basis of numbers of contacts and volunteers; and so on.

I'm reminded of the story of the wealthy woman who owned a huge ranch and invited some of her business associates to see it. After they toured the vast acreage and the spectacular mansion, they wound up in back by the largest swimming pool any of the guests had ever seen. However, this pool was filled with sharks.

The rich owner explained: "I value courage more than anything else. Courage is what made me a success. In fact, I place such a high value on courage that if anyone is brave enough to jump in that pool, swim through those sharks and make it to the other side, I will give that person anything--my house, my land, my money. Anything."

All the guests laughed at the absurd challenge and turned around to follow the owner into the house for lunch--when suddenly, they heard a splash! They turned around and saw one of the men in the party thrashing through the shark-infested water, swimming for his life through the maze of hungry creatures. Finally, he made it to the other side.

The owner, shocked and amazed, stuck to her promise. "You are, indeed, a person of courage, and I'll stick to my word. You can have anything--my house, my land, my money--just tell me what you want."

The swimmer gasped for breath and said, "I just want to know one thing: Who the hell pushed me in that pool?"

Well, folks, we are swimming with the sharks now--and it really doesn't matter whether we jumped in or were pushed. What matters is how well and how fast we swim. What matters is how we respond to the many voices in our society who are telling us we are not giving them what they want for their money. What matters is that we

commit ourselves--as institutions and as individuals--to bringing about a renaissance in our outreach agenda.

Machiavelli wrote in *The Prince:*

> "There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things."

If Cooperative Extension is to remain the aggressive, relevant program Seaman Knapp envisioned, we must learn to regard change not as a threat to our survival, but as an opportunity to regain the high ground.

Such a renaissance will not happen by accident. It must begin here, with the leaders in this room. At the same time, such change cannot simply be compelled from on high--it cannot be achieved merely with a reshuffling of administrative structures and a handful of insightful reports that do little more than serve as a shield for continuing to do "business as usual." As Seaman Knapp said, "What a man hears, he may doubt; what he sees, he may possibly doubt; but what he does, he cannot doubt." The process of change must engage all who are affected--it must be devised at the hands of those at work in each county, by the academic faculty on our campuses, by those who depend on our services, by those who potentially could benefit but who now do not. We must change together, and we must do it now.

In truth, the opportunity for change, to regain lost territory, is an exciting prospect that should carry great appeal to an agency that--from its inception--has been designed to help people achieve "a higher plane of profit, comfort, culture, influence and power." Still, as I have reviewed past lectures delivered in this forum, I realized that nearly all of them have issued the call for change, and the prescription for doing so still remains unclear. At Colorado State, we have committed ourselves to an organizational and programmatic transformation of Cooperative Extension that we hope will create a coherent and integrated approach to university outreach. In doing so,

we have proposed a new architecture for Cooperative Extension that includes both functional and structural changes, including:

- Consolidation of Cooperative Extension, continuing education and Agricultural Experiment Station programs into regional outreach, education, and research centers. Such a move allows for cost-containment because of shared staff and technical resources; provides an improved basis for flexible and responsive programming; and moves away from county-based programming to an issue-based model that transcends county lines.

- Heavy reliance upon distance learning and communications technology for program delivery. Enhanced use of new technologies will allow us to deliver information more rapidly, to reach people in remote areas more affordably, and to reduce costs associated with delivering programs on a "one on one" basis.

- Administrative reductions and organizational changes to remove bureaucratic layers and eliminate barriers between central administration and field agent decisionmaking. Field agents should be empowered to innovate, initiate and assume full responsibility for program implementation--and they should not have to filter issues through one or two layers of administration. Creating a more direct relation between agents and central administration will increase agent effectiveness and result in more timely decisionmaking.

- Access and ownership of outreach across campus. In the past, we have relied heavily on the model of "faculty Extension specialist." However, with the growth of private companies providing technical expertise--and with the increasingly complex and multifaceted problems we now must address--such a model has become ineffective. Every faculty member should be regarded as a specialist whose skills may be brought to bear in developing and delivering programs. Field agents must now serve more as information brokers, directing university expertise

to areas of greatest need. At Colorado State, we have tested a team interdisciplinary approach to address such things as systemic issues in the Colorado cattle industry--and it has been extremely effective. The primary requirement for such a system to work is an outreach commitment that transcends colleges, departments, and disciplines.

- Consumer-based programming. Our programming should be based on consumer need--identified through a partnership between users and professionals, with clear distinction between "needs" and "wants" and evidence that users are ready to collaborate with a team to address well-defined goals and objectives. Such a model requires that constituents assume greater responsibility for the outcome of programs, with Extension empowering people through education and training to solve problems for themselves.

- Increased program access by under-served and diverse populations, especially children and families. In all our programs, but particularly through 4-H, we should identify strategies and new conduits to reach populations--that traditionally have not been well-represented or well-served by our programs.

Our challenge at times, seems as daunting as that put forth by Carl Sagan when he said, "If you wish to make an apple pie from scratch, you must first invent the universe."

Well, we do not need to reinvent the universe, but we do need to reinvent our outreach programs in a form that responds to the needs of contemporary society. The strategies I have offered here are clear and attainable, but to undertake any of these efforts will not be simple. To do so will require that we be willing to change and adapt to the needs of a society considerably different from the one in which Seaman Knapp lived and worked. Dramatic change, as needed, will require vision and courage.

But with these challenges comes enormous opportunity--opportunity to position the land-grant university as an essential player in meeting the educational demands of a diverse and demanding country--opportunity to become again the kind of organization that Seaman Knapp and his peers first envisioned.

- - - -

Joint Program Session

Council on Academic Affairs,
Council on Governmental Affairs,
and Council on University Relations and Development

A Summary Presentation:
The Evolving Role of State Universities in the System of State Government Priorities.
How and Where Should Our Institutions Position Themselves in Their States by the Year 2001?

Moderator: Richard M. Schoell, University of Illinois
Speaker: Michael Crow, Columbia University

November 8, 1994

MR. SCHOELL: I'd like to hit on just a couple of key points and summarize them from the previous session and put them in context for our speaker this morning. First, I was intrigued by the issues that were explored this morning, and this whole idea of federalism really came forward, I thought, beautifully. First, there is this whole sorting out of responsibilities. What level of government should essentially take the responsibility for higher education governance as we move ahead? Where does responsibility rest with respect to accountability? Where does it rest with respect to ideas to improve our institutions? I think there were two very different kinds of notions that were offered this morning by our two panelists. First, I would like to say that we are, as we address these issues this morning, creatures of state government. We are also partners, most of us, with the federal government in terms of our research enterprise. I would suggest that most of the institutions represented here this morning probably have budgets of which somewhere between 50 and 60 percent of their entire operating budget comes from some public funds, whether they are state government funds or whether they are federal funds supporting research programs.

With that, we automatically should expect to have some kind of government interest in our programs. And we invite intrusion, hopefully in the best sense, of quality and accountability. But the fact that we do accept public money, I think puts us in a context of being responsible to the various constituencies that determine outcomes--legislative bodies, executive bodies, and so forth. I think the issue before us this morning in the first panel was how do we strike a proper balance between that accountability, those issues with respect to accreditation, and how do we strike that balance between what should be quality programs and this excessive regulatory burden mandated standards that President Lawrence spoke about. I think when we cast that net that he talked about in terms of regulating the innocent rather than punishing the guilty, he said that probably pretty well. There has been a vigorous effort on the part of both the state and federal government to try to address problems of accountability and responsiveness by casting this broad net of government regulation and mandates.

So we ask the question again of how do we confront this in a constructive fashion. And that's what we hope to explore this morning as we move ahead toward the year 2001. And I think the key issue that came out this morning was when Mr. Quern suggested, as did President Lawrence, we need to communicate better. It's not so much what's happening, as Mr. Quern said, it's why is it happening. Why is government getting into standards and curriculum? Why are they asking questions about access, and tuition, and pricing? Why are they asking questions about how you conduct your research? And one of the things we often struggle with are these conflicting signals that come from both the federal government and from the state government. In other words, get out, do a lot of economic development, transfer technology, but don't subsidize industry and be very careful to avoid conflicts of interest. One of our responsibilities is, I think, to try to help decisionmakers shape a strategy for the future that will help put us on a constructive path toward meeting our mission and goals as higher education institutions particularly with respect to education, research, and public service.

I'm delighted that we are joined by Michael Crow. He is going to lay this strategy out for us this morning in a way that hopefully will inspire a lot of questions and comments on your part. Mike, as many of you know, in 1991 joined Columbia University, where he presently serves as vice provost and professor of public policy. Before that, Mike was at Iowa State University, and he was the director of the Institute for Physical Research and Technology, where he distinguished himself truly in building an incredible research program for Iowa State University. I had the pleasure of working with Mike on a couple of programs during his tenure at Iowa State. Many of you also know Mike's writings in the area of science policy and technology assessment and in higher education design. He's been a prolific writer and contributor in these very interesting and important areas of inquiry. So I'm delighted, Mike, that you could join us today. And Mike will set out for us a strategy on how we can position ourselves within the context of the states and the future. Mike, welcome.

MR. CROW: Thanks, Rick. I probably should start off with a truth in lending, truth in advertising statement just to let everyone know that Columbia University is in fact a land-grant university, but not a land-grant from the United States government--a land-grant from the king of England. In the 1750s, the king of England decided in his one and only province--there were 12 colonies and one province in what was then America--and in the province of New York there was a land-grant made by the king to found a university in his name, called King's College. And until the revolution, it did quite well. During the revolution it ceased to exist. After the revolution it had a different name and went a different direction. So I come to you a little bit from that perspective.

Setting aside that humor, I'm going to try to accomplish three things. My masters here said focus strategically, think about strategic questions, think about strategic steps that universities can take in thinking about how to best interact with state government, how to best interact with the federal government, how to best interact with each other. So I'm going to do that in three ways.

First, I'm going to talk a little bit about my view of the situation, which is somewhat more distant than your view from the perspective that I've had looking out of my window in Manhattan the last few years. So I'm going to give an outsider's view, if you will, of the situation in terms of state universities and government. Second, I'm going to focus some of our thinking, I hope, through a series of strategic questions--questions that I think are very important for us to think about as universities, very important for us to think about as state universities. And lastly, I'm going to try--and I emphasize the word try--to outline some strategic steps for success in terms of enhancing or improving this relationship between the university community and the government.

Before I do these three things, however, let me come back to Columbia just for a second. Columbia is a university that has pursued greatness in isolation, pursued greatness on its own, pursued greatness outside of a democratic system of accountability--that is it is an institution that stands on its own and moves forward its own objectives. It does this with a crowd of other universities that many of us would think about as being among the best universities in the United States. And if you look at what those universities have as similar characteristics, I think they reveal a trend--and I have to be cautious about overstating this--but they reveal a trend worth thinking about before I move into the strategic questions.

For instance, if you look at most national rankings of national universities, be they the ones in the common press or the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council rankings or what have you, what you will see is the following. They have several similar characteristics which affect all of them. One, they have an elite student body. That is, a highly selective student body, emphasis on the word elite. Second, they have an elite faculty. However that's measured, just accept for the sake of argument that the faculty if not actually elite, perceives themselves to be elite. They have an elite or high ranking library generally. That is, they have a big capacity to store knowledge and have done so for a long period of time. They have a very high cost. They are expensive institutions to engage with. They are expensive institutions to interact with. They have almost

exclusively very minimal influence from any government. They do have influence from the government. They obviously like Columbia. Our operating budget last year--let's round of the numbers--was $1 billion. Of the $1 billion, about $300 million came from government. But it's a different way of doing business in terms of the kinds of interactions with government these elite universities have those similar characteristics.

Now let's take some of those elite universities. Let's take Yale University in New Haven, Columbia in New York City, Penn in Philadelphia, and the University of Chicago in this city. Look at the communities that those universities exist in--not just the neighborhoods, but the cities--and say to yourself, what has been the net positive result of that focus on isolation, that focus on separatism, that focus on elitism. And you would begin to ask yourself a series of serious questions about whether or not in fact the striving by most American universities for those same sets of conditions that I listed is in fact something that they should be striving for. And so I offer that as a premise, and we can come back and talk a little bit about this if you like.

So remember, I'm going to try to do three things in terms of thinking strategically. First, a situation analysis. Second, a set of strategic questions that I hope we can actually spend some time talking about. And third, a set of strategic steps that might be useful in terms of working in the long term to enhance success.

First, the situation analysis. The dominant characteristic of the situation is that obviously--and most of us see this--is that there are a number of symptoms of the rapid decline of the public trust in the public institutions that we call universities. That's occurring. We're aware of it. I won't focus on it or belabor it. I think, as we heard this morning from the commissioner of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, he attributes that declining public trust to our inability as universities to make tough decisions, to govern ourselves, and to improve and advance our institutions in significant ways. And then out of that then, the following situational facts I think are important, and they play to the questions that I'm going to focus on.

First, government is seeking to control and influence all sectors in significant ways. Higher education is not immune from this attempt to control and never has been--ever. I recently read a book about a famous botanist that became the president of the university that I graduated from--Iowa State University--and this famous botanist became the president of Iowa State University when the sitting president was fired by the state legislature while he was on a trip in the 1880s because he was more interested in basic science than he was in applied science. So they basically threw him out. Now, while he was gone--now if that's not political intervention, I don't know what is. And so I would suggest, and many of you from your own institutions could look back over your own histories and suggest that this notion somehow--and remember I'm trying to paint the situation here--this notion somehow that we are experiencing new waves of governmental control or new waves of governmental influence isn't true. We are experiencing new directions of a continuing attempt on the part of the government to influence our institutions.

Second, it's a situation analysis. Universities as institutions do not appear to be engaged in the issues of the day. I don't imagine that very many of the people pulling the voting arms in the voting booths today have the interests of our institutions--the interests of the public universities in particular--prominent in their thinking as they go in and cast their votes for public officials. Some of you might want to disagree with that, but I could probably find some others in the room other than myself who could argue.

Third, government seeks increased accountability for its investments. That's an absolute fact. Just assume that that's the case. Take that as a condition.

Next, universities are not viewed as critical public service entities that are helping everyone. They are only helping some. These are my conditions for where I go to the questions and then the recommendations.

Obviously, government trust in universities is greatly diminished--not permanently damaged, not inalterably affected, but diminished. It's

in a down cycle. Of a long period of up, it's in a down cycle. Also, the situation obviously--and I'm stating the obvious here, but they lead to my questions--government wants more from the universities but at the moment has limited resources. At the moment. After 70 or 80 years of significant investment, significant growth, significant institution-building, construction and deployment of higher education resources on a scale like the world has never seen, the building of whole institutions from whole cloth, the expansion of major universities like Rich University into the essential equivalent of an academic city in this same timeframe. Now, all of a sudden in the mid 1990s when we see control and so forth and so on, we go crazy. After 70 or 80 years of significant, major investment.

And so the government wants more from the universities but they want innovation, and they want resilience, and they want creativity, to be able to extract from the capital investment the sum costs that have been made as well as the operating costs that they are presently investing.

The general situation is--I would disagree with President Lawrence--the general situation is not bleak. The general situation basically has these characteristics. There's turbulence in the policy environment. There's turbulence that has to be met. There are things that universities have to do. And in thinking about what to do, let me pose the following questions. And these are questions--if nothing else is remembered from what I say, I hope that some people will think about these questions. These are strategic questions that I hope can help you to think about state government relations, help to think about federal government relations, help to think about how the universities ought to position themselves relative to these situational trends that I mentioned.

Here's the first question: If the states and regions are so different--and they are socially, economically, from a natural resource perspective, from an ethnic perspective, from every possible perspective, our states and our regions are not the same--if they are so different, why are universities so much alike? Why do the universities not reflect these differences? Why do all the universities work to

attempt to be the same thing, to strive toward that same objective--that elite isolated, out of government control, non-democratically influenced institution? Why do they strive toward that? Why do they all build the same departments? Why do they all have--or mostly have--the same profile? If the states and the regions so different, why are the universities so much alike? Late last night I was talking with a colleague of mine, and we were wondering why it is that provosts and vice provosts and presidents are interchangeable. They can move from one position to the next position like that. They can move from one legislature to the next legislature like that. And some of you might even have experienced that. That is because the universities are exceedingly similar, wherein the states are not.

Second question, a strategic question worth thinking about: How often is the interest of the state held up as superior to the interest of the university? Now, you might say, all the time. I would say not very often. The university views itself as a separate and distinct community--a community which is separate, perhaps, from the interest of the state. When one thinks strategically, one has to constantly ask that question. How often is the interest of the state held up as being superior to the interest of the university? There is an interest higher than the interest of the institution itself.

Third question: What is wrong with political input to universities in a democratic society? The institution that I come from was founded by a monarch who was interested in the education of the sons of elite land holders. It still is an elite institution with a high entry cost. Political inputs to our institution are resisted on every front, on every corner, in every possible way. But at a public institution, what is wrong with political input to universities? What is wrong with developing mechanisms for democratic oversight, and democratic control, and enhanced democratic inputs--that is, enhanced mechanisms for listening to what the people want?

Fourth: What is wrong with universities as institutions--not as individuals--as institutions participating in the critical issues of the day? That means rising up to tackle critical issues in organized, interdisciplinary, focused, funded ways. Why can't that be done? I'm

not saying that it's not done, I'm just saying that it's not done often. It's not done often enough. Remember, these are strategic questions, ways to think about how to plan for the future.

Next question: Why can't the university be focused on its state or region as its dominant focus? Why must every institution grant 20 Ph.D.s, 40 Ph.D.s, 50 Ph.D.s, 90 Ph.D.s? Why can't the focus be on the region? What does the region need? I used to be the assistant director of an energy research center funded by the state of Illinois, located at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. That region of Illinois--I don't know how many people are here from SIU, maybe someone--that region of Illinois is very different from this region as you might imagine. If you've been down there, it's in effect a completely different socio-economic environment. Perhaps the state of Illinois could best be benefitted by locating an institution in southern Illinois focused exclusively on the interests of that area of the state and the building of that area of the state. And that that is the theme of that institution.

Next question: Why have we not replaced the simple teaching, research, and service objectives with the broader set of objectives that many of our institutions, many state universities, are actually attempting to pursue? Why don't we have, for instance, a stated list of missions. Not every university would have each of these missions. Some universities would have all of them. Some universities would have all but one of them. Some universities might have a couple. But a stated list of missions that goes something like this: instead of teaching about lifelong education and learning, instead of research, how about fundamental discovery? How about knowledge dissemination and storage? How about taking that as a mission? How about service to society--not just service or outreach--but service to society as a stated mission in the context of these other missions? Innovation development and transfer. And then lastly, as the sixth major mission, technology assessment. I sort of throw that in on my own. Universities are guilty of developing massive amounts of new technology and massive amounts of new ideas and applying very little of their social science knowledge into understanding the impact of

those or assessing those technologies before in fact they go out and affect society.

Two last strategic questions: Of those five or six missions that I talked about--and we have to think about this strategically in terms of if you're in Illinois and you're deploying the resources of 15 state universities or in New York where you're working with many more than that, state universities and state colleges--why can't each of those missions that I talked about be of equal value to the university and to the society and strive to communicate that they are of equal value. We don't do that. Teaching is everything. The independence of the professor is everything. Maybe there's a multiplicity of missions that we should think about. Maybe there are institutions that would focus on one of these missions and be equal to another university focusing on another mission, together, then, meeting the needs of the state that they operate in.

Here is a final strategic question, which some of you will find as perhaps odd: Why are invisible colleges the way that sociologists talk about colleagues and disciplines working together at different institutions in forming disciplinary linkages, forming invisible colleges. Why are invisible colleges more important than real colleges, where the faculty members are side-by-side, supposedly working with each other toward some community purpose or toward some community end? And that last point is a strategic question in the sense that if one is devoting resources or assets to one's institution so that what they can do is be great at the formation of invisible colleges, so that they can be great colleagues with their colleagues in England, and France, and China, and California, or wherever their invisible college colleagues work, perhaps something is being missed in terms of why one has formed a college of arts and sciences to operate in central Colorado to work for and serve the people of Colorado. So why are invisible colleges more important than real colleges?

Now, moving to this next part that I want to talk about. It has not been easy for me to think about--given those questions--what are some of the elements of a formula that one might use as the elements

of successfully rethinking how to interact with this democratic system that wants to exert more control over our universities. When I move to these elements of this formula, I don't want us to lose track of these questions because I don't think we ask enough strategic questions of ourselves in thinking about how to best communicate what we're doing, best deploy our energies, or what have you.

So, a formula for success, which Rick asked me to spend some time focusing on. Some of these will seem obvious, and some of them might seem silly. I don't know. We'll see. I see that President Gee is here from Ohio State, and he'll start laughing at a couple of these perhaps. Nonetheless, first, all of our energy should be focused on educating state policy makers on our mission capabilities, our mission performance, and our striving for uniqueness within that mission profile, not on our fund requests. Not on what we heard about earlier from New Jersey or from Illinois, that is, on the couple of percent of delta difference in the budget on an annual basis. The focus of attention, the focus of communication, the focus of state relations, the focus of the words going out from the university should focus on mission capabilities of the particular institution communicating, the striving for uniqueness of that institution, and not on the fund requests.

Second, these are parts of a formula or the beginning of a formula. We need to think about how to design and deploy more linkages from the institutions individually to state issues, state programs, and other state institutions. If the state of Illinois has as its dominant most important critical issue crime, prisons, drugs, and K-12 education, and the higher education institutions in the state of Illinois are deploying two or three percent of their energies toward those objectives, perhaps that's not enough of a connection. Perhaps there's not enough of a linkage.

Third, presidents must become issue active, policy advocates. They must stand up, they must take the heat, they must fight for something other than the funding for their school. It doesn't mean that one doesn't do that. One does that in the context in which it's supposed to be done, that is, with the higher education authorities and so forth.

But with the general community, the presidents of the universities have got to stand up. They have got to speak out. They have got to be vocal as the spokesperson for the institution on issues. That means not necessarily just the president operating or acting as a trustee, but perhaps evoking findings of study groups at the university or long-term discussions at the university, or ideas that have come forth from the university community, and using those ideas as a part of the state policy debate. Presidents do some of this, but they don't do enough of this. And I think it has affected the way in which universities are viewed. I don't want to use the word money grubbers with presidents in the room, but it has been told to me from time to time that some presidents get frustrated with the concentration of their efforts on that particular task--money and resource acquisition, as opposed to being a leader in a policy setting within a given state.

On a statewide basis, universities need to develop mechanisms for enhanced program review and evaluation in all mission areas. Let's assume we have the simple mission of teaching, research, and service versus some broader mission as I articulated. Even then we do not have mechanisms for good program review and evaluation in all of those areas. We concentrate our energies on our teaching program. We allow our research programs to measured by one thing--dollar volume. If you are a research one university, you got to be a research one university because you could hustle more money and had faculty members who would write more proposals than other people. That's not a good indicator of the impact of the research activity of one's institution on the state in which they operate.

Second, on a statewide basis--this is a difficult concept because it's not a well thought out economic concept, and if there's an economist here maybe they could add to it. But some economists have developed the notion of social profit, and the calculation of social profit, which is different than economic profit. And that is that for dollars that are invested in public institutions, there are outcomes that add to the social well-being of the population. A calculation of that improvement in social well-being can be equated to a calculation of social profit. We need to develop social profit measures for university activity and evaluate state investments accordingly. I think

that the results would be profound based on what we already know about social profit calculations just for agricultural research alone. You know, there's a 26 to 1 return in investments that are being made in agricultural research alone. We don't know much about the return that's being made on investments being made by states in other areas because we haven't thought enough about these measures.

Two more elements to the formula--coming from me, you might laugh at this--but universities have to strive to be non-elitists. One of the things that I think is killing us is that we have evolved to be elitist institutions. There is no one in this room who doesn't exist or operate at least above the 90th percentile of the income profile of the American citizenry. No one in this room. The number is much lower than you would imagine. And yet our faculty, who also operate for the most part in a very high income profile, relative to the American population as a whole, argue for more and more and more and more. And they want tighter standards for admission. And they want to focus on just a few things. And they maybe want to teach less. And they want to evolve into a certain type of institution. That doesn't sell well with the Central Iowa Trucking Association. But there might be some things that the university could do that could be helpful to the Central Iowa Trucking Association or groups like that. My grandfather was a founding member of that association.

Lastly in terms of formulas--focus on service delivery for a broad set of missions and objectives and work to educate the public and their representatives on how universities are deploying their resources relative to all of those objectives, rather than just relative to a few of them.

So I think that's a few elements of a formula. Let me sum very quickly with the following. It's 1995, let's say. I'm supposed to think about the future. I think it's time for us to do several things. If we're going to think strategically, we have to think about strategic questions. I've thrown out some examples of strategic questions. Maybe everybody will say we think about those all the time. We ponder those all the time. I don't know. I mean, I'd be happy to talk about that. I think it's time to rethink our attitude. I can tell you that

in Washington, universities are perceived as whining brats. I don't know if there are others of you who spend a lot of time in Washington that would concur. Does anybody concur with that general characterization? No one? I'm alone?

So first, it's time to rethink our attitude. We've got a bad attitude. People are perceiving our bad attitude. Second, it is time to embrace democratic control and oversight, not to repel it, but to embrace it. Third, it's time to develop meaningful measures of mission success. Fourth, it's time to drop the hyperbole--the sky is falling, American higher education will be dead on the rocks on the side of the sea in a crashed ship. Not very likely. It's time to embrace change, and it's time to accept responsibility for our own future. I think that our commissioner who spoke earlier said it right when he said either we start thinking about these types of things now or they will be done for us. And that is an absolute certainty that they will. History tells us that in every possible way. So, with that, I will take my disjointed thinking and bring it to an end.

- - - -

Commission on Food, Environment, and Renewable Resources

Plenary Session

Sustainable Human Development: A Paradigm for the 21st Century

Remarks by

Thomas Malone
North Carolina State University

November 6, 1994

I would propose to summarize several months of lively discussion with the advisory committee and the steering committee by touching on four topics. First, a brief backdrop. Second, where we are headed. Third, where might we be headed. Fourth, what should we do. Fifth, what about NASULGC?

As backdrop, almost a half century ago a distinguished writer and conservationist wrote a book called *Our Plundered Planet*. In that book he had a seminal statement which sort of sets the stage. He said, "The study of history could be eliminated if the fact that conditions resulting from the use and misuse of natural resources were recognized as definite factors in the migration of people and the origins of war."

Almost a quarter of a century ago the environmental movement burst forth. Two years ago a hundred heads of state and 30,000 individuals gathered in Rio to reflect on this issue. And out of that emerged the notion that economic development and environmental quality are two sides of the same coin. And today, on the threshold of the first century of the third millennium, we should stop and look at the

prospects and where we're headed. And I would propose to do that by touching on the population and the capacity to convert natural resources into goods and services.

On population, we can look ahead to 2050 and say if we proceeded at the rate that is now underway in the industrial countries, in some of the developing countries, and in the less developed countries where would we get. And that slide shows where we are and where we might go and what else we might do. The black bars are the present population--about 1 billion in the first, about 2 billion in the second and third rank. And if we proceeded at the rate of growth during this decade, the red bars would show the outcome. There are a lot of facts in there. The essential point it this: that the world population would treble to about 15 billion, and, of special interest, in the less developed countries, the *increase* in the population would exceed the population of the entire world in 1991. In the United States we would add about 200 million people. So wherever there are 25 people today, there would be 45 people in 2050--just to give you a reference point.

An option is in that green, internal set of bars, where suppose that the population rate were halved. Now, you see, it is useful to use scenarios rather than predictions because they are notoriously unreliable. And these sort of establish some limits. If the population rate were increased by one-half everywhere, then the world population would only approximately double to about 9 billion. And the increase in the less developed countries would be less than one-half of the world population today. And our population would increase from about 250 million to about 350 million in the United States.

That's one part. The next part is the economic productivity--the capacity to convert natural resources into goods and services. And again, if we take the same three groupings of countries and use the black bars to indicate where we are now and the red bars to indicate where we would go if we proceeded at the rate of change in economic productivity during the 1980s--population was 1990s--then you could see where we would get. The interesting thing is that this is sort of an inverted pyramid to the population, if you will. In industrial countries, the growth is enormous. In industrial countries, the

increase in the total production of goods and services between now and 1950 would two-and-one-half times the current production of goods and services. That's just a measure of what's going on.

And you can see the contrast there between the industrial countries and the less developed countries. Right now, the ratio per person--and that's what really matters--is about 13 to 1. And if we proceeded along those lines, it would go up to more than 20 to 1. So that is the measure of the contrast.

A second point, however, is that whether we go along present paths or trajectories, or modify them, and that's the green, modification, where we moderate slightly the economic growth in the industrial countries. Now, I'm not recommending zeroing that out at all--and increase the rate of growth in the less developed countries, you'd have the green bars. And you can see there that we begin to move away from what I call an unsustainable, inequitable and unstable path to one just beginning to approach equity, sustainability and stability. And that's illustrated in the next transparency, which shows the result of looking at these two scenarios. And if you look at the top line, it shows that about 10 percent of the population in the world would be using about 40 percent of the world's resources. That's the very top line. Ten percent of the people in 46 industrial countries using 40 percent of the world's production of goods and services. The less developing countries, comprising 50 percent of the world's population, would share only 10 percent. You see the inequity in that. The total production would increase by a factor of 8. Scenario B shows that you haven't begun to approach equitability. Twenty percent--actually it's about 17 percent--would be sharing a little more than 20 percent--actually about 24 percent--and the 40 percent in the less developing countries would have about 30 percent. Not complete equity, but we must distinguish between equality and equity. Equity is really equality of opportunity.

Now, that's where we're headed. Where might we want to go? It's necessary, first of all, to have some kind of a vision of where we want to go before you start worrying about how you would get there. And we have arrived at a vision which is described as a society in which

the basic human needs--food, clothing, shelter, and so on--and an equitable share of aspirations and wants can be met by successive generations--intergeneration equity--while maintaining in perpetuity a healthy, physically attractive and biologically productive environment. And I commend this vision to you to frame your own vision of what NASULGC thinks our society should be. And we're talking about a world society, or we're talking about a national society embedded in that increasingly interdependent world.

The path toward this kind of vision, I submit, is presented in the next transparency. It is a maturing of the popular buzz word of sustainable development. We have commissions, we have presidential commissions, we have U.N. commissions on sustainable development. I suggest that it is time that we put people in between those two words--sustainable and development--and call it sustainable human development, which empowers individuals to expand their options and enlarge their opportunities. It provides meaningful employment, generating income for vital needs, amenities and, of course, an equitable share of wants with only an equitable share. It regenerates, rather than degrades the environment.

Now, what does all of that imply? How can we begin to approach that path of sustainable development which leads to a new and, I submit, within reach vision of society today. The next transparency, summarizes what I think really gets at the heart of the matter and a special opportunity to NASULGC. It is that human progress is deeply rooted in advances in the cascade of knowledge that embraces the discovery, basic research, integration, dissemination and application of knowledge concerning the characteristics and interaction of matter, energy, living organisms, information and human behavior. I am sure that's not strange to a NASULGC audience. It's simply an elaboration of teaching, research and extension. It represents a maturing in that triumph of the last 100 years, which has been deeply rooted in the NASULGC institutions.

Now, it seems to us that the 21st century could be the first era in the history of civilization when advances in the cascade of knowledge reached a stage of which you could envision this pursuit of this new

vision of society. And that, I believe, is the challenge to you and to all of us--NASULGC and those outside. It would involve, for example, entirely new modes of interdisciplinary collaboration. It would involve entirely new patterns of communication and cooperation among business, industry, government, universities and the private sector--private organizations. A real challenge is to weave together the physical sciences, life sciences, social sciences, engineering and the humanities. There are deep issues of ethics and values involved in what we are talking about here. And unless we weave those together, we're not going to make progress.

We also need to utilize the power of modern technology, information handling, communications. And we need some kind of a vision of what we can do during that 21st century. And the next transparency shows a sort of a vision which would be dependent upon interdisciplinary collaboration, intersectoral cooperation, utilization of technology, and probably most difficult of all, a change in our way of thinking. I call it metanoia--turning around of the mind. And it's called a global array of nested networks. A group from around the world met in the Research Triangle Park last year and said that this is the kind of vision of what could be put in place to pursue this societal vision that I've been talking about.

Now really, there are four levels. There is the level down there at the bottom which brings people together exchanging views at the grassroots--bottoms up, not just tops down. The second level, educational institutions. The third level, research programs. And the fourth level, policy--both in the public and the private sector. All interacting and communicating in the audiovisual mode that's going to come within reach during the early part of the 21st century.

So that is a vision that I commend to you as something that should be approached, pursued thoughtfully and systematically in the way NASULGC has pursued national interests in food and industry over the last 130 years.

What does that lead to then by way of recommendations? There are a lot of recommendations, and they will be in the report. They are

still couched in the form of a point of departure, as Jerry mentioned, for discussion. There is no blueprint. I'm not arrogant enough to think that anyone, any white paper, can lay out a complete blueprint for the future. The recommendations are coming up. There are a whole bunch of them. Some are more important than others. We can't dwell on them all.

They are addressed to the NASULGC institutions. They are addressed to the government. They are addressed to the business sector. They are addressed to the society in general. And they are intended to respond to these needs. These are the needs that undergird. These are the things that the global array of nested networks should address, deepening our understanding of the great physical, chemical, biological and socio-economic forces that regulate the human environment. Particularly, I draw to your attention, transforming an energy and technology-driven socio-economic system into one that is more environmentally benign, obviously stabilizing population as the recent Cairo meeting attempted to set in motion the proper steps. And this fourth and most difficult, reexamining society goals with greater emphasis upon the quality of life and sustainable human development and, of course, reducing poverty everywhere; the 1.3 billion people in those less developed countries, that one class of poverty--absolute degrading poverty. We have more than 30 million people in the United States living below the standard poverty line. So these are the tasks that this global array of nested networks should undertake. And they are sort of the framework in which NASULGC could ascertain what it can do in the immediate future and how it should organize itself and these institutions to accomplish that.

Now I think we're ready for the recommendations. There are nine of them. We won't dwell on them all, but simply say that it would be appropriate for the commission, the several commissions, to prepare formal statements which should elaborate, improve, refine, and extend the things talked about here, set up a vision, emphasize the critical role of knowledge, the cascade of knowledge, the actions required for these five things we just looked at, the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration and institutional cooperation, the role of new computer

and communication technology, and, one would hope, a commitment to a leadership role.

Institutions of higher education are really the custodians of knowledge. It is knowledge that holds the key to the glass door through which attractive vistas for humanity can be seen in the rather forbidding mist of the next few decades. Then this is perhaps a challenge and, given the critical state of higher education today, perhaps an opportunity for institutions of higher education. Internal actions, that's up to each institution--the interdisciplinary research, like the coastal zone research; peer review, Arthur Chong has written a nice appendix on that; and, of course the crucial problem of how you reward and encourage faculty. Those are some internal issues.

The next transparency shows some of the external contacts. I think it's appropriate to establish dialogue with the federal government, with the National Science and Technology Council, which is a marvelously effective integrating agency in the federal establishment; to talk with the states because I am convinced that there is a greater role for the states in the decades ahead than is presently pursued; carry on a discussion with the business roundtable or other private sectors; scholarly communities in both the domestic and international scene, and they are spelled out in the report; and I think it would not be inappropriate to convene a national summit in 1996 if NASULGC wants to play a leadership role to address these issues.

We've been sending money and we've been sending troops around the world to address transnational problems. It's time we did something about the knowledge aspect. And the two points I'm going to come back to on the technology for a sustainable future and prototype networks and then international research programs are mentioned and an extension on the kind that's pursued out in Nebraska and adjoining states on convening local regional forums to discuss these issues because we are addressing not just a transformation technology but a transformation in the way that the products of technology are consumed and utilized. And then I would suggest--and I know it's not too bold, why not--a Century 21 World Forum on Sustainable Human Development in about 1998 to bring the resources of the world to

address these issues which are going to determine the prospects for humanity in the 21st century.

So those recommendations are available in the report. And now a few words about some immediate things that can be done, and one is to address this issue which has emerged of technology for sustainable development. There was an initiative that came out from the National Science and Technology Council in July which proposed a program along this line of transforming the socio-economic system into one which is environmentally benign. There's the report. I commend your attention. The next slide shows what is involved in that. It's more than just machines. It's the software as well as the hardware. And I would say that even the federal government has not quite reached out to the consumer part as well as the producer part. There's the definition. It involves all those things--improving systems efficiency, process efficiency, creating products and processes that are environmentally benign, and technology, I urge you, is intended to include hardware/software systems and services and, in my view, what has to be added is the consumer.

The next transparency shows some of the elements of that strategy. The important thing is that it was launched in July, is being discussed in workshops around the country today, there will be a White House conference in December, and the program will be launched in April on Earth Day 1995, and it is one which I think needs an input from NASULGC at this time. The emphasis is on prediction, on monitoring increasingly to stabilize with less control and remediation and restoration as time goes on. Right now, we're in the control, remediation and restoration phase. Down through the decades the two top curves are going to prevail, and they are the ones that will require attention. They are the ones that I feel need the kind of broad based integrated knowledge that is available at NASULGC institutions.

And the last slide shows the several stages in this process: the July announcement; the workshops now underway--we're having one in Research Triangle Park a week from tomorrow; the ceo meeting in Washington on December 12 and 13; then followed up by firming up of the policy, and the formal announcement of the program in April

of 1995. So here is the immediate task. It's not something that should be put off and addressed some time in the future. These are things here and now underway, and in my view they urgently need more involvement of the academic community.

There is one more initiative which I invite your attention. It's a modest start on the notion of a division of a global network which would connect people and institutions around the world. This Spring, a group met at the new Jordan University for Science Technology and said that the problems in the Middle East are sufficiently serious, complex and interrelated that we ought to have an integrated regional program. They like the idea of a global array of nested networks. They said we need first a prototype. No one is going to put in place a global array of nested networks overnight. You've got to do it step by step. And they said why don't we join forces and establish a prototype here.

We'll skip the next slide because it simply says that these countries want to do it. They're looking for partners. The European Rectors Conference is interested in this, and I commend it to your attention. I think the groundwork has been laid for an exciting prototype demonstration. It's the kind of thing, the small discreet step that is the essence of resolving great problems.

And here is a statement that came out from the countries down there. You'll note that Israel is not there. It's obviously hidden. It will be there, should be there, it must be there. The stage is set I think for something like this to undergird the political processes underway in that fractious part of the world.

Now, how can you pay for this. We're living in a era of priorities. You can do this with no new money by reordering the priorities in the official development assistance that the industrialized countries are maintaining by making a modest three percent reordering of priorities. You could get quite a few billions of dollars by looking at the yield from the transition from military expenditures very modestly something like three percent you'd get some more money. And the developing countries, because they are spending $120 billion a year

and the three percent of that would yield a nice piece of change. And our own expenditures in the industrialized countries would yield more. So it can be done. And since we are in an age of priority reordering, this is the time to raise our voices.

If you get the impression that I'm proposing that NASULGC start a crusade for sustainable human development, then you've heard right. I think we have got the impression. You might ask yourself the question, well since knowledge is the key, if not NASULGC, who else? If not in this decisive decade for the century, when? And my sense is that this marvelous array of educational institutions has the potential to change society in the next hundred years. Thank you.

- - - -

The Assembly

The Assembly convened on Sunday, November 6, at 4:45 p.m. The Assembly is composed of the members of the Association's Board of Directors and up to ten representatives from each of the six Commissions. Its responsibilities are to bring issues before the Association, receive reports from the commissions and their sub-units, and to make policy recommendations to the Board of Directors. This meeting is open to all annual meeting participants.

President Lois DeFleur, State University of New York at Binghamton, was announced as chair-elect of the Association, with Chancellor Laurel Wilkening, University of California at Irvine, and Presidents William Kirwan, University of Maryland, College Park, and Ernest L. Holloway, Langston University, elected to the Association Board of Directors, Class of 1997. Presidents John Byrne, Oregon State University, and Manuel Pacheco, University of Arizona, were elected as chair and secretary, respectively, to the Council of Presidents.

Frederick S. Humphries, President, Florida A&M University, passed the gavel to Association Chair-Elect, Nils Hasselmo, President, University of Minnesota.

Deloitte & Touche

1900 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20036-3564

Telephone: (202) 955-4000
Facsimile: (202) 955-4294

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Board of Directors of
National Association of State Universities
and Land-Grant Colleges:

We have audited the accompanying balance sheets of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (the Association) as of December 31, 1993 and 1992, and the related statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in fund balances, and of cash flows for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Association's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform an audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, such financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges as of December 31, 1993 and 1992, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Deloitte & Touche
March 25, 1994

Deloitte Touche
Tohmatsu
International

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

BALANCE SHEETS
DECEMBER 31, 1993 AND 1992

	1993			1992		
	General Fund	Restricted Fund	Total	General Fund	Restricted Fund	Total
ASSETS						
CASH	$ 52,003	$ 191	$ 52,194	$ -	$ -	$ -
SHORT-TERM INVESTMENTS	2,345,214	74,992	2,420,206	2,354,821	882,256	3,237,077
ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE	229,536	15,741	245,277	106,527	1,975	108,502
PREPAID EXPENSES	9,786	-	9,786	20,654	-	20,654
FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT, Net of accumulated depreciation of $284,594 in 1993 and $237,555 in 1992	147,467	-	147,467	188,605	-	188,605
LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENTS, Net of accumulated amortization of $168,352 in 1993 and $153,248 in 1992	29,974	-	29,974	44,048	-	44,048
DUE (TO) FROM OTHER FUNDS	(357,861)	357,861	-	(281,224)	281,224	-
Total assets	$ 2,456,119	$448,985	$ 2,905,104	$2,433,431	$1,165,455	$3,598,886
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES						
LIABILITIES						
Accounts payable	$ 232,576	$ -	$ 232,576	$ 295,257	$ -	$ 295,257
Accrued expenses	109,443	-	109,443	65,265	-	65,265
Deferred revenue						
Grants	-	448,985	448,985	-	1,165,455	1,165,455
Other	14,928	-	14,928	18,933	-	18,933
Total liabilities	356,947	448,985	805,932	379,455	1,165,455	1,544,910
FUND BALANCES	2,099,172	-	2,099,172	2,053,976	-	2,053,976
Total liabilities and fund balances	$ 2,456,119	$448,985	$ 2,905,104	$2,433,431	$1,165,455	$3,598,886

See notes to financial statements

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

STATEMENTS OF REVENUES, EXPENSES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES
YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1993 AND 1992

	1993			1992		
	General Fund	Restricted Fund	Total	General Fund	Restricted Fund	Total
REVENUES						
Member dues	$2,807,005	$ -	$2,807,005	$2,605,245	$ -	$2,605,245
Grants and project support	130,520	1,176,054	1,306,574	157,261	1,079,406	1,236,667
OAPBC support	35,543	-	35,543	46,196	-	46,196
Investment	148,520	25,221	173,741	144,765	26,928	171,693
Annual meeting	273,581	23,470	297,051	288,877	20,595	309,472
Seminars	80,177		80,177	69,994	-	69,994
Other				25,201	-	25,201
Total revenues	3,475,346	1,224,745	4,700,091	3,337,539	1,126,929	4,464,468
EXPENSES						
Personnel	1,420,906	654,676	2,075,582	1,331,786	564,818	1,896,604
Staff benefits	318,066		318,066	317,675	-	317,675
Payroll taxes	97,451		97,451	91,595	-	91,595
Consultants	89,279		89,279	63,218	-	63,218
Temporary and other personnel costs	57,457		57,457	42,917	-	42,917
Professional fees	62,822		62,822	67,952	-	67,952
Rent	187,095		187,095	185,786	-	185,786
Office supplies and services	94,379	143,278	237,657	99,639	137,260	236,899
Telecommunications	70,022	-	70,022	58,380	-	58,380
Postage and express mail	84,629	-	84,629	61,572	-	61,572
Depreciation and amortization	67,099		67,099	66,926	-	66,926
Computer systems	46,899		46,899	37,372	-	37,372
Annual meeting	242,484		242,484	229,278	-	229,278
Meetings		71,419	71,419	-	49,074	49,074
Travel and representation	100,420	38,108	138,528	85,548	23,452	108,998
Councils and commissions	123,859	-	123,859	97,653	-	97,653
Publications	122,973	29,085	152,058	90,310	12,692	103,002
Duplicators and copiers	96,461	-	96,461	56,895	-	56,895
Scholarship	-	284,738	284,738	-	337,504	337,504
Seminars	86,113	-	86,113	63,754	-	63,754
Other	41,756	3,441	45,197	43,764	2,129	45,893
Total expenses	3,430,150	1,224,745	4,654,895	3,092,018	1,126,929	4,218,947
EXCESS OF REVENUES OVER EXPENSES	45,196	-	45,196	245,521	-	245,521
FUND BALANCES, BEGINNING OF YEAR	2,053,976	-	2,053,976	1,808,455	-	1,808,455
FUND BALANCES, END OF YEAR	$2,099,172	$ -	$2,099,172	$2,053,976	$ -	$2,053,976

See notes to financial statements

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS
YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1993 AND 1992

	1993	1992
CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES:		
Excess of revenues over expenses	$ 45,196	$ 245,521
Depreciation and amortization	67,099	66,926
Changes in assets and liabilities:		
(Increase) decrease in accounts receivable	(136,775)	16,499
Decrease (increase) in prepaid expenses	10,868	(10,715)
(Decrease) increase in accounts payable	(62,681)	219,317
Increase (decrease) in accrued expenses	44,178	(232,142)
Increase in deferred revenue	40,076	89,932
Net cash provided by operations	7,961	395,338
CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES:		
Purchase of furniture, equipment, and leasehold improvements	(11,887)	(38,088)
Decrease (increase) in short-term investments	56,320	(465,215)
Net cash provided by (used in) investing activities	44,433	(503,303)
INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH	52,394	(107,965)
CASH, BEGINNING OF YEAR	-	107,965
CASH, END OF YEAR	$ 52,394	$ -

Noncash Transactions: During 1993, the Association transferred assets of approximately $761,000 to the Thurgood Marshall Scholarship Fund. This amount had been reflected in short-term investments and deferred revenue.

See notes to financial statements.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1993 AND 1992

1. ORGANIZATION

The National Association of State Univer s and Land-Grant Colleges (the Association) was formed in 1887 and is incorporated in the District of Columbia as a nonprofit corporation.

The Association has 172 members which include principal state universities, land-grant campuses, and university system administration offices. The Association's overriding mission is to support high-quality public education through efforts that enhance the capacity of members to perform their traditional teaching, research and public service roles.

2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Fund Accounting - To ensure the observation of limitations and restrictions placed on the use of resources available to the Association, the accounts of the Association are maintained in accordance with the principles of fund accounting whereby resources for various purposes are classified for accounting and reporting purposes into funds that are in accordance with specified activities and objectives. The restricted funds include amounts restricted by members of the organization, by the terms of the various grants and contracts, or by the funding sources for specific purposes. The restricted funds are segregated from the general fund.

Investments - The Association's investment portfolio is carried at cost.

Furniture and Equipment and Leasehold Improvements - Furniture and equipment are recorded at cost. Depreciation is computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the assets, which range from three to eight years. Leasehold improvements are amortized over the estimated useful life of the asset (eight years) or the life of the lease, whichever is shorter.

Income Taxes - The Association is exempt from Federal income taxes on income other than unrelated business income under Section 501(c)3 of the Internal Revenue Code and is classified as an organization that is not a private foundation. The Association is also exempt under the applicable tax regulations of the District of Columbia.

Restricted Fund Revenue - Contract and grant receipts that are restricted as to use by the terms of the contract, grant, or other arrangement are deemed to be earned and are reported as revenue when the Association has incurred expenses in compliance with the funding restrictions. Amounts received but not yet earned are reported as deferred revenue.

Restricted Funds included in cash and short-term investments of the General Fund are presented as a payable and receivable between the funds.

Cash Flows - The Association does not classify its short-term investments as cash equivalents.

Reclassifications - Certain reclassifications have been made in the 1992 financial statements to conform with current year presentation.

3. SHORT-TERM INVESTMENTS

Short-term investments consisted of the following at December 31, 1993 and 1992:

	1993	1992
Money market fund	$ 496,552	$1,055,485
Commercial paper	-	125,000
Corporate obligations	1,472,680	404,623
Government and government agency obligations	450,974	1,651,969
Total	$2,420,206	$3,237,077
Market value	$2,389,864	$3,249,104

4. COMMITMENTS

The Association occupies office space under a lease which will expire December 31, 1996. The lease provides for a monthly rental which may be increased for a proportionate share of real estate taxes and certain operating expenses. Rental expense for office space was $187,095 in 1993 and $185,786 in 1992.

The Association also leases office equipment under various leases expiring through 1999. Rent expense under these leases was $36,396 in 1993 and $37,673 in 1992.

The schedule of future minimum lease payments is as follows:

Year ending December 31,	
1994	$250,576
1995	250,576
1996	230,399
1997	44,652
1998	38,156
Thereafter	946
	$815,305

5. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

All full-time employees are covered under a defined contribution pension plan. The plan provides for full vesting upon two years of service. The plan is funded through the purchase of individual annuity contracts, and an expense is charged for the total annual premiums due on such contracts. Pension expense was $196,887 in 1993 and $188,736 in 1992.

6. RELATED PARTIES

Prior to December 30, 1993, the Association administered the Thurgood Marshall Scholarship Fund (TMF) as a restricted program. On December 30, 1993, the Association transferred assets of approximately $761,000 to the Thurgood Marshall Scholarship Fund, a newly created entity formed to administer TMF. A balance of $24,000 remains to be paid at December 31, 1993, and is included in unrestricted accounts payable in the accompanying balance sheet.

Several officers of the Association serve as officers or board members of other organizations related to higher education. There were no significant transactions between the Association and these other organizations during 1993 or 1992.

7. NEW ACCOUNTING PRONOUNCEMENTS

Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 116, *Accounting for Contributions Received and Contributions Made* and SFAS No. 117, *Financial Statements of Not-for-Profit Organizations* were recently issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board. SFAS Nos. 116 and 117 are effective for the Association in fiscal year 1995. The impact on the Association's financial position and results of operations from adoption of these pronouncements has not yet been determined.

* * * * * *

Elected Heads of the Association
1887-1994

Editor's Note: Until 1979, the elected head of the Association was called the President and the staff director was called the Executive Director. Beginning in 1979, the elected head of the Association is called the Chairman and the staff director is called the President.

An individual serving as Chair-elect serves the following year as Chair.

Chair-elect	Name	Member Institution
1887	George W. Atherton	Pennsylvania State University
1889 (Jan)	George W. Atherton	Pennsylvania State University
1889 (Nov)	J.H. Smart	Purdue University
1890	H.H. Goodell	University of Massachusetts
1891	W.L. Broun	Auburn University
1892	W.A. Henry	University of Wisconsin
1893	S.D. Lee	Mississippi State University
1894	M.E. Alvord	Oklahoma State University
1895	S.W. Johnson	Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station
1896	George T. Fairchild	Kansas State University
1897	H.C. White	University of Georgia
1898	H.P. Armsby	Pennsylvania State University
1899	H.E. Stubbs	University of Nevada
1900	A.W. Harrisa	University of Maine
1901	W.M. Ligget	University of Minnesota
1902	J.K. Patterson	University of Kentucky
1903	W.O. Thompson	Ohio State University
1904	E.B. Voohees	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
1905	M.J. Buckham	University of Vermont
1906	L.H. Bailey	Cornell University
1907	J.L. Snyder	Michigan State University
1908	M.A. Scovell	University of Kentucky
1909	W.J. Kerr	Oregon State University

1910	W.H. Jordon	Cornell University
1911	W.E. Stone	Purdue University
1912	E.H. Jenkins	Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station
1913	A.C. True	U.S. Department of Agriculture
1914	E.A. Bryan	Washington State University
1915	C.E. Thorne	Ohio State University
1916	K.L. Butterfield	University of Massachusetts
1917	Eugene Davenport	University of Illinois
1918	C.A. Lory	Colorado State University
1919	Samuel Avery	University of Nebraska
1920	H.L. Russell	University of Wisconsin
1921	T.D. Boyd	Louisiana State University
1922	Howard Edwards	University of Rhode Island
1923	R.A. Pearson	Iowa State University
1924	A.F. Woods	University of Maryland
1925	E.A. Burnett	University of Nebraska
1926	H.A. Morgan	University of Tennessee
1927	J.L. Hills	University of Vermont
1928	Anson Marston	Iowa State University
1929	A.M. Soule	University of Georgia
1930	G.W. Rightmire	Ohio State University
1931	E.O. Holland	Washington State University
1932	J.C. Futrall	University of Arkansas
1933	T.O. Walton	Texas A&M University
1934	F.L. McVey	University of Kentucky
1935	J.G. Lipman	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
1936	Alfred Atkinson	Montana State College
1937	C.W. Creel	University of Nevada
1938	J.A. Burruss	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
1939	F.D. Farrell	Kansas State University
1940	F.M. Mumford	University of Missouri
1941	J.D. Hoskins	University of Tennessee
1942	E.E. Day	Cornell University
1943	C.B. Hutchinson	University of California
1944	C.S. Boucher	University of Nebraska

1945	T.P. Cooper	University of Kentucky
1946	R.D. Hetzel	Pennsylvania State University
1947	J.L. Morrill	University of Minnesota
1948	J.A. Hannah	Michigan State University
1949	A.S. Adams	University of New Hampshire
1950	R.F. Poole	Clemson University
1951	M.S. Eisenhower	Pennsylvania State University
1952	A.A. Hauck	University of Maine
1953	F.L. Hovde	Purdue University
1954	Lewis Wesbster Jones	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
1955	Irvin Stewart	West Virginia University
1956	M.T. Harrington	Texas A&M University
1957	A.N. Jorgensen	University of Connecticut
1958	C.C. French	Washington State University
1959	C.M. Hardin	University of Nebraska
1960	J.A. Perkins	University of Delaware
1961	J.T. Caldwell	North Carolina State University
1962	N.G. Fawcett	Ohio State University
1963	Elmer Ellis	University of Missouri
1964	David D. Henry	University of Illinois
1965	Edgar F. Shannon, Jr.	University of Virginia
1966	James H. Jensen	Oregon State University
1967	W. Clarke Wescoe	University of Kansas
1968	Fred H. Harrington	University of Wisconsin
1969	Richard A. Harvill	University of Arizona
1970	Wilson H. Elkins	University of Maryland
1971	David W. Mullins	University of Arkansas
1972	W. Robert Parks	Iowa State University
1973	Lewis C. Dowdy	North Carolina A&T State University
1974	Ernest L. Boyer	State University of New York System
1975	Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr.	University of California, Irvine
1976	Harry M. Philpott	Auburn University

1977	Glenn Terrell, Jr.	Washington State University
1978	Edwin Young	University of Wisconsin
1979	A.R. Chamberlain	Colorado State University
1980	Harold Enarson	Ohio State University
1981	Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.	State University of New York System
1982	Robert Q. Marston	University of Florida
1983	Edward J. Bloustein	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
1984	C. Peter Magrath	University of Minnesota
1985	I.M. Heyman	University of California, Berkeley
1986	John DiBiaggio	Michigan State University
1987	Stanley O. Ikenberry	University of Illinois
1988	Chase N. Peterson	University of Utah
1989	Robert M. O'Neil	University of Virginia
1990	Donald N. Langenberg	University of Maryland System
1991	Lattie F. Coor	Arizona State University
1992	James McComas	VPI & State University
1993	Frederick Humphries	Florida A&M University
1994	Nils Hasselmo	University of Minnesota

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Member Institutions 1994

ALABAMA

Alabama A&M University*
Auburn University*
Tuskegee University
University of Alabama System
University of Alabama
University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Alabama in Huntsville

ALASKA

University of Alaska Statewide System*
University of Alaska Fairbanks

ARIZONA

Arizona State University
University of Arizona*

ARKANSAS

University of Arkansas System
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff*

CALIFORNIA

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
California State University
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Sacramento
University of California*
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Barbara

COLORADO

Colorado State University*
University of Colorado
University of Colorado, Boulder

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station*
University of Connecticut*

DELAWARE

Delaware State College*
University of Delaware*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

University of the District of Columbia*

FLORIDA

Florida A&M University*
Florida Atlantic University
Florida International University
Florida State University
The State University System of Florida
University of Central Florida
University of Florida*
University of South Florida

GEORGIA

Fort Valley State College*
Georgia State University
University of Georgia*

GUAM

University of Guam*

HAWAII

University of Hawaii*

IDAHO

University of Idaho*

ILLINOIS

Southern Illinois University
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
University of Illinois*
University of Illinois, Chicago
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

INDIANA

Indiana University
Purdue University*

IOWA

Iowa State University*
University of Iowa

KANSAS

Kansas State University*
University of Kansas
Wichita State University

KENTUCKY

Kentucky State University*
University of Kentucky*
University of Louisville

LOUISIANA

Louisiana State University System*
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
Southern University System*
University of New Orleans

MAINE

University of Maine System
University of Maine*

MARYLAND

University of Maryland System
University of Maryland, College Park*
University of Maryland Eastern Shore*

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts Institute of Technology*
University of Massachusetts*
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Massachusetts at Boston

MICHIGAN

Michigan State University*
Michigan Technological University
Oakland University
University of Michigan
Wayne State University
Western Michigan University

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota*

MISSISSIPPI

Alcorn State University*
Mississippi State University*
University of Mississippi
University of Southern Mississippi

MISSOURI

Lincoln University*
University of Missouri*
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of Missouri, Kansas City
University of Missouri, Rolla
University of Missouri, St. Louis

MONTANA

Montana State University*
University of Montana

NEBRASKA

University of Nebraska*
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

NEVADA

University of Nevada, Reno*

NEW HAMPSHIRE

University System of New Hampshire
University of New Hampshire*

NEW JERSEY

New Jersey Institute of Technology
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey*

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico State University*
University of New Mexico

NEW YORK

City University of New York
City University of New York, Graduate School and University Center
Cornell University*
State University of New York
University at Albany, SUNY
University at Binghamton, SUNY
University at Buffalo, SUNY
University at Stony Brook, SUNY

NORTH CAROLINA

East Carolina University
North Carolina A&T State University*
North Carolina State University*
University of North Carolina
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota State University*
University of North Dakota

OHIO

Bowling Green State University
Cleveland State University
Kent State University
Miami University
Ohio State University*
Ohio University
University of Cincinnati
University of Toledo
Wright State University

OKLAHOMA

Langston University*
Oklahoma State University*
University Center at Tulsa
University of Oklahoma

OREGON

Oregon State University*
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Portland State University
University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania State University*
Temple University
University of Pittsburgh

PUERTO RICO

University of Puerto Rico*

RHODE ISLAND

University of Rhode Island*

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson University*
South Carolina State University*
University of South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota State University*
University of South Dakota

TENNESSEE

Tennessee State University*
University of Memphis
University of Tennessee*
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

TEXAS

Prairie View A&M University*
Texas A&M University System
Texas A&M University*
Texas Tech University
University of Houston System
University of Houston
University of North Texas
University of Texas System
University of Texas, Arlington
University of Texas, Austin
University of Texas at San Antonio

UTAH

University of Utah
Utah State University*

VERMONT

University of Vermont*

VIRGIN ISLANDS

University of the Virgin Islands*

VIRGINIA

University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
& State University*
Virginia State University*

WASHINGTON

University of Washington
Washington State University*

WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia University*

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin System
University of Wisconsin-Madison*
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

WYOMING

University of Wyoming*

---

* Indicates land-grant institution

Bylaws

of the

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Article I -- Principal Office and Registered Agent

A. The principal office of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, a nonprofit corporation incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia (hereinafter the "Association"), shall be in the District of Columbia.

B. The Association may have such other office or offices at such suitable place or places within or without the District of Columbia as may be designated from time to time by the Association's Board of Directors.

C. The Association shall have and continuously maintain a registered office in the District of Columbia and the Association's President shall appoint and continuously maintain in service a registered agent who shall be an individual resident of the District of Columbia or a corporation, whether for profit or not for profit.

Article II -- Purposes

The Association is organized and is to be operated exclusively for charitable and educational purposes within the meaning of Sections 501(c)(3) and 170(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (or the corresponding provisions of any future United States internal revenue law). The purposes of the Association are as set forth in the Articles of Incorporation.

No part of the net earnings of the Association shall inure to the benefit of or be distributed to the members of its Board of Directors, Assembly, officers, members, any private individuals, or any organiza-

tions organized and operating for profit, except that the Association shall be authorized and empowered to pay reasonable compensation for services rendered and to make payments and distribution in furtherance of its purposes as set forth in Article II, hereof.

No substantial part of the activities of the Association shall be the carrying on of propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation. The Association shall not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office. Notwithstanding any provision in these Bylaws or in the Association's Articles of Incorporation, the Association shall not carry on any activities not permitted to be carried on:

(a) By an organization exempt from federal income tax under Section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as an organization described in Section 501(c)(3) of such Code (or the corresponding provisions of any future United States internal revenue law),

(b) By an organization described in Sections 509(a)(1), (2), or (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (or corresponding provisions of any future United States internal revenue law), and

(c) By an organization described in Sections 170(c)(2), 2055(a)(2), or 2522(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (or the corresponding provisions of any future United States internal revenue law).

Article III -- Membership

A. Membership Classification.

The Association shall have one class of members. Members shall not have the right to vote, except as part of their membership on Association Boards, Commissions, Committees and Councils described below. All members of the Association shall consist of institutions of higher education, each of which qualifies under Section 115(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or is exempt from Federal income

taxation under Section 501(a) of such Code as an organization described in Section 501(c)(3) of such Code, and is an organization described in Section 509(a)(1), (2), or (3) of such Code (or the corresponding provisions of any future United States internal revenue law), and which meet the following additional criteria:

1. All members of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities as of November, 1960 shall be and continue to be eligible for membership in the Association, subject to payment of annual dues, regardless of any other provisions hereof, other than the foregoing provision of this Article III.

2. The membership of the Association may also include:

(a) All universities in the states and territories of the United States which are founded wholly or in part upon those grants of land made by Congress to the states upon their admission to the Union, which grants are commonly known as seminary or university grants;

(b) Every college or university established under the Land-Grant Act, approved by the United States Congress on July 2, 1862, or receiving the benefits of the Second Morrill Act, approved by the United States Congress on August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented;

(c) Any member as of July 1, 1963, of the National Association of State Universities, not otherwise eligible for membership;

(d) Separately governed state universities and universities which are part of a multi-campus state system, which meet the following criteria:

(1) The institution has substantial state responsibilities in instruction, research, and extension.

(2) The institution's instructional program includes a substantial and diversified complex of programs leading to the Ph.D.

degree and to post-baccalaureate professional degrees conferred by the faculty of that campus.

(3) Research is a substantial purpose and budget of the institution and is recognized substantially in the institution's criteria for faculty appointment and advancement.

(4) Extension and public service are in fact a substantial commitment of the institution beyond the immediate community in which the institution is situated and/or are over and above the offering of evening classes and lectures and the like.

(5) When the institution is a part of a multi-campus university system, membership must be recommended by the officer holding executive responsibility over the existing member institutions in the system; and

(e) An office of a multi-campus university system which in fact exercises executive responsibility over one or more institutional members of the Association.

3. Dual Members. Upon petition to the Association, an institution which is already a member of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) may also become a member of the Association, provided that the institution maintains its American Association of State Colleges and Universities membership status and also meets one of the following categories as defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in its most recent classification of colleges and universities.

(a) Doctorate-Granting Universities II
(b) Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I
(c) Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II
(d) Liberal Arts Colleges I
(e) Liberal Arts Colleges II

4. Non-Member Affiliates. The Association may also admit to membership such other non-member affiliate institutions having a common purpose as the Board of Directors may elect.

B. Election to Membership. Membership shall be granted upon the approval of two-thirds of a quorum of the Board of Directors.

C. Revocation or Termination of Membership. Any member of the Association may have such membership revoked or terminated by affirmative vote of two-thirds of a quorum of the Association's Board of Directors, whenever in the Board of Directors' judgment it is in the best interest of the Association. Termination of membership is automatic whenever such member loses eligibility for such membership under the criteria as stated in Article III A, hereof.

D. Reinstatement. Any member of the Association, the membership of which has been revoked or terminated under Article III C, hereof, may be reinstated to membership by action of the Board of Directors.

Article IV -- Meetings of Members

A. Annual Meeting. An annual convention of the membership of the Association shall be held at a time, day and place decided by the President, for the purpose of transacting any and all business that may be brought before the meeting.

B. Notice of Meeting. Written or printed notice, stating the time, day and place of the annual meeting, shall be delivered to all members not less than ten (10) days prior to the date of the meeting.

Article V -- Operating Rules and Structure

The general structure of the Association shall be as set forth in Article VI through X below. However, because of the complexity of the Association's structure and operating procedures, the Board of Directors is hereby authorized to create a document to be known as the Association's Rules of Organization and Structure (hereinafter "Rules or Organization"), which shall set forth in more detail the structure of the

Association and composition of its sub-organizations. Said Rules of Organization may be amended at any general or special meeting of the Board of Directors by resolution of a majority vote of a quorum present.

Article VI -- The Assembly

A. General. There shall be an Assembly of the Association, which shall have the responsibility of bringing issues to the attention of the Board of Directors, to receive reports from the Commissions and their sub-units, to make policy recommendations to the Board of Directors, and to perform such other functions as the Board may from time to time direct.

B. Membership. The membership of the Assembly shall consist of (1) all members of the Board of Directors of the Association, and (2) up to ten representatives from each of the Commissions, to be selected by each Commission. Each member of the Assembly shall serve a term of three years.

C. Meetings. The Assembly shall meet at least once each year at the annual meeting of the Association. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Association Chair.

Article VII -- Board of Directors

A. Powers and Duties. The Board of Directors shall have all the powers and authority necessary to carry out the purposes and functions of the Association and all of the powers to perform all of the duties commonly incident to and vested in the Board of Directors of a corporation. No unit of the Association other than the Board of Directors is authorized to take action in the name of the Association on broad policy or legislative matters.

B. Election/Term. The members of the Board of Directors shall be selected as described in paragraph C below. Except for elected officers and the Chair of the Council of Presidents, no individual may serve for more than three consecutive years on the Board of Directors.

C. Membership/Qualifications. The Board of Directors of the Association shall be composed of:

1. The Chair of the Association, the Chair-Elect of the Association, and the Past Chair of the Association, each elected by the Board of Directors for a one-year term.

2. Six Chief Executive Officer Representatives, each elected by the Board of Directors for a three-year term.

3. One Council Representative elected by each of the Councils for a three-year term.

4. One Commission Representative elected by each of the Commissions for a three-year term.

The qualifications of Council and Commission Representatives shall be as set forth in the Association's Rules of Organization. Except for the Chair, Chair-Elect, Past Chair, and Chair of the Council of Presidents, as members of the Board of Directors, no more than one individual from a member institution shall hold membership on the Board of Directors at any one time.

D. Meetings. A regular annual meeting of the Board of Directors shall be held at least once each year. Other special meetings may be held on call by the Chair or by written request of a majority of the members of the Board of Directors.

E. Notice. Written or printed notice, stating the time, day and place of each meeting, shall be delivered to each member of the Board of Directors at least ten (10) days prior to the day of each meeting.

F. Quorum; Voting. A majority of the Directors then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Board of Directors, provided that in no event shall a quorum consist of less than one-third of the Directors. Except as otherwise expressly required by law, the Articles of Incorporation, or these Bylaws, the affirmative vote of a majority of the Directors present at any meeting

of the Board of Directors at which a quorum is present shall be the action of the Board of Directors. Each Director shall have one vote. Voting by proxy is not allowed.

G. Written Consent. Action taken by the Board of Directors without a meeting is nevertheless Board of Directors action if written consent to the action in question is signed by all of the Directors and filed with the minutes of the proceedings of the Board of Directors, whether done before or after the action so taken.

H. Resignation. Any Director may resign at any time by giving written notice to the President of the Association. Vacancies on the board shall be filled in accordance with paragraph C above as soon as practical.

I. Removal. Any Director may be removed from office by a majority vote of the Directors at any regular or special meeting of the Board of Directors at which a quorum is present, for (1) violation of these Bylaws or (2) engaging in any other conduct prejudicial to the best interests of the Association. The Director involved shall be provided ten days notice of the charges against him or her and an opportunity to respond in person or in writing as the Board of Directors may determine. In these regards, the Board of Directors shall act on the basis of reasonable and consistent criteria, always with the objective of advancing the best interests of the Association.

J. Steering Committee. There shall be a Steering Committee of the Board of Directors of the Association.

1. Membership. The Steering Committee shall be composed of the Association's Chair, Chair-Elect and Past Chair, plus the six presidents/chancellors' representatives. The Chair of the Board of Directors shall serve as Chair of the Steering Committee.

2. Responsibilities. The Steering Committee will be responsible for setting the agenda for Board of Directors' meetings, for dealing with the internal administration of the Association, for oversight and review responsibility for Association positions on public policy

issues affecting the interests and welfare of the membership, and for such other matters as may be set forth in the Rules of Organization.

3. Meetings. The Steering Committee shall meet at the request of the Chair or at the request of a majority of the members. Meeting notices generally shall be delivered to members at least ten (10) days prior to the convening of a meeting, but this provision may be waived by all members of the Committee to accommodate discussion of situations of a compelling nature.

Article VIII -- Officers

A. Enumeration of Officers. The officers of the Association shall consist of a President, a Chair, who shall also serve as Chair of the Board of Directors and Chair of the Steering Committee, a Chair-Elect, a Past Chair, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, and may include such other officers as may be deemed necessary.

B. Officeholder Combinations. Any two or more offices of the Association may be held by the same person, except the offices of President and Secretary.

C. Term of Office. The officers of the Association shall be elected by the Board of Directors as described below and shall be installed at the annual meeting at which they are elected. Officers shall hold office for one year or until their respective successors shall have been duly elected and qualified.

D. Nomination of Chair-Elect. A candidate for Chair-Elect, who shall become Chair of the Association at the annual meeting following his/her election as Chair-Elect, shall be nominated by a committee consisting of such members as the Board of Directors may determine.

E. Election of Chair-Elect. The Chair-Elect shall be elected for a period of one year by a majority vote of the Board of Directors during the annual meeting of the Association. He/she shall assume office at the close of the meeting in which he/she is elected and shall serve until the

following annual meeting of the Association, at which time he/she shall assume office as Chair of the Association.

F. Duties of the Chair. The Chair of the Association shall have all powers and shall perform all duties commonly incident to and vested in the office of the chairman of a corporation, including but not limited to being the chief executive officer of the Association. The Chair shall also preside at the general meetings of the Association and the Steering Committee.

G. Duties of the Chair-Elect. The Chair-Elect shall serve as a member of the Board of Directors of the Association and shall become familiar with the work of the Association.

H. Duties of the Past Chair. The Past Chair shall serve as a member of the Board of Directors.

I. Duties of the Secretary. The Secretary of the Association shall have all powers and shall perform all duties commonly incident to and vested in the office of secretary of a corporation, including attending all meetings of the Board of Directors and the Assembly, being responsible for keeping the books and preparing the annual reports of the Association, and distributing true minutes of the proceedings of all such meetings.

J. Duties of the Treasurer. The Treasurer of the Association shall have all powers and shall perform all duties commonly incident to and vested in the office of treasurer of a corporation, including collecting dues, dispensing funds, and having the accounts of the Association audited annually.

K. President and Staff

1. President. The President of the Association shall be employed on an annual basis for full-time service by the Board of Directors. The President shall perform such duties as the Board of Directors may direct, and shall also administer the national headquarters of the Association, which shall be in Washington, D.C.

2. Staff. Staff members, who shall have employment at will, shall be employed/dismissed by the President consistent with the Association personnel policies and the annual budget adopted by the Board of Directors. Members of the staff of the Association shall be given such titles and perform such duties as may be assigned by the President.

L. Resignation. Any officer may resign at any time by giving written notice to the President of the Association.

M. Removal. Any officer may be removed by the Board of Directors at any regular or special meeting of the Board of Directors at which a quorum is present, whenever in its judgment the best interests of the Association would be served thereby. The President may be removed as specified in his or her employment contract. Vacancies shall be filled as soon as practical.

N. Compensation. The Association may pay compensation in reasonable amounts to officers for services rendered, such amounts to be determined by a majority of the entire Board of Directors.

Article IX -- Councils

A. Creation of Councils. The Board of Directors may authorize the creation of one or more Councils of the Association, empowered to make recommendations to the Board of Directors in their respective fields and to perform such other functions as the Board of Directors may from time to time determine. The composition, powers and duties of each Council shall be as set forth in the Association's Rules of Operation. The creation or discontinuation of a Council shall be by a majority of a quorum present vote of the members of the Association's Board of Directors.

B. Representation in the Assembly and on the Association Board of Directors. Each Council shall be entitled to representation in the Assembly by its representative on the Board of Directors.

Article X -- Commissions

A. Creation of Commissions. The Board may authorize the creation of one or more Commissions of the Association, empowered to maintain oversight over broad issue areas of vital and/or unique interest to the Association members, to develop policy positions and programs within their purview, to communicate with relevant constituencies, and to perform such other functions as the Board of Directors may from time to time determine. The composition, powers and duties of each Commission shall be as set forth in the Association's Rules of Operation. The creation or discontinuation of a Commission shall be by majority vote of a quorum of the Board of Directors.

B. Representation in the Assembly and on the Association Board of Directors. Each Commission shall be entitled to representation in the Assembly by up to ten representatives selected by the Commission. Each Commission also shall be represented on the Board of Directors by a president/chancellor elected by the Commission. Such selection to membership in the Assembly and designation as representatives on the Board of Directors shall be for such terms as set forth in the Association's Rules of Operation.

Article XI -- Miscellaneous Provisions

Section 1. Fiscal Year. The fiscal year of the Association shall commence on January 1 and terminate on December 31.

Section 2. Notice. Whenever under the provisions of these Bylaws, the Articles of Incorporation of the Association or statute, notice is required to be given to a director, committee member, or officer, such notice shall generally be given in writing by first-class, certified, or registered mail, but may be given by any other reasonable means available. Written notice shall be deemed to have been given when deposited in the United States mail or delivered to the express delivery service. Other methods of notice such as telephone, electronic mail, or facsimile, will be deemed given when received.

Article XII -- Indemnification

To the extent permitted by applicable law, the Association shall indemnify any present or former director or officer for the defense of any civil, criminal or administrative claim, action, suit or proceeding to which he or she is made a party by reason of being or having been an officer or director and having acted within the scope of his or her official duties; subject to the limitation that there shall be no indemnification in relation to matters to which the individual shall be adjudged guilty of a criminal offense or liable to the Association for damages arising out of his or her own negligence or misconduct in the performance of duties. Furthermore, in no case shall the Association indemnify or insure any person for any taxes imposed on such individual under chapter 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, nor shall payment by made under this Article if such payment would constitute an act of self-dealing or a taxable expenditure under sections 4941(d) or 4945(d), respectively, of the Code.

Amounts paid by the Association in indemnification of its directors and officers may include all judgments, fines, amounts paid in settlement, attorneys' fees and other reasonable expenses actually and necessarily incurred as a result of such proceeding or any appeal therein. The Board of Directors also may authorize the purchase of insurance on behalf of any director, officer, employee or agent against any liability asserted against him or her which arises out of such person's status or actions on behalf of the Association, whether or not the Association would have the power to indemnify the persons against that liability under law.

Article XIII -- Dissolution or Final Liquidation

Upon any dissolution or final liquidation, the Board of Directors of the Association shall, after paying or making provision for the payment of all the lawful debts and liabilities of the Association, distribute all of the assets of the Association to one or more of the following categories of recipients as the Board of Directors shall determine:

(a) A nonprofit organization or organizations which may have been created to succeed the Association, as long as such organization or organizations are organizations (1) the income of which is excluded from

gross income under Section 115(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or (2) exempt from federal income tax under Section 501(a) of such Code as an organization described in Section 501(c)(3) of such Code (or the corresponding provisions of any future United States internal revenue law); and/or

(b) A nonprofit organization or organizations having similar aims and objectives as the Association and which may be selected as an appropriate recipient of such assets, as long as such organization or each such organizations are organizations (1) the income of which is excluded from gross income under Section 115(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or (2) exempt from federal income tax under Section 501(a) of such Code as an organization described in Section 501(c)(3) of such Code (or the corresponding provisions of any future United States internal revenue law).

Article XIV -- Amendments

These Bylaws may be amended by two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors at any regular or special meeting of the Board of Directors. An amendment shall be effective immediately after adoption, unless a later effective date is specifically adopted at the time the amendment is enacted.